





A

# CHARGE

DELIVERED

## TO THE CLERGY

OF THE

UNITED DIOCESES

OF

OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN,

AT HIS

PRIMARY VISITATION

IN SEPTEMBER, 1842.

---

BY JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D. D.,

BISHOP OF OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN.

---

*PHILADELPHIA:*

JAMES M. CAMPBELL & CO., 98 CHESTNUT STREET.

NEW YORK: SAXTON & MILES, 205 BROADWAY.

---

1843.

GIHON, FAIRCHILD & Co., PRINTERS,  
S. E. corner of Seventh and Market Sts.



283  
Obbe  
1843

TO THE  
CLERGY OF THE UNITED DIOCESES  
OF  
OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN,

THIS CHARGE,  
PRINTED AT THEIR REQUEST,  
*IS INSCRIBED*  
WITH VERY SINCERE RESPECT AND REGARD,  
BY THEIR  
FAITHFUL FRIEND AND BROTHER,  
J. T. OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN.

The following Charge was written entirely for the Clergy to whom it was addressed. And in preparing it for their information, and guidance, and warning in these perilous times, I had no thought of taking any step to make it serve the same office for others. But when they, in each of the dioceses in which it was delivered, united in an earnest request that it should be published, I did not feel that I was at liberty to withhold my consent. I should probably have never made the engagement, if I could have anticipated that I should have been so long in fulfilling it. I can only say now, in excuse for the great and unlooked-for delay which has occurred in the publication, that it has arisen altogether from the pressure of duties, which, whether more important or not, I could not but feel to be very much more urgent. And it is fortunate that those to whom chiefly I have to offer the excuse, are the very persons by whom its reasonableness can be best appreciated.

I ought to add, that in revising the sheets while they were going through the press, it appeared occasionally desirable to give some further proofs and illustrations of the statements which they contained, and that these additional quotations are at times made from publications which have appeared since the charge was delivered. This is the chief, if not the only difference which those who heard it will find in it, as they read it.

## A CHARGE.



MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

It is the happy privilege of our Master's service, that we may rest upon Him for support under every burthen that He lays upon us. And, having been called to the important office which I hold, in the course of His government of His Church, and, I trust, however unworthy, according to His will, I feel that I am to engage in its various arduous duties rather in a spirit of reliance upon His strength, than of distrust in my own weakness. And, indeed, when I consider what momentous interests are hanging upon the right discharge of those duties, even the very lightest of them would be an intolerable load, if I could not, in some degree, however imperfectly, exercise this privilege, and cast the burthen upon Him, who has promised, and who is able, to sustain it.

The duty in which I am now about to engage, is certainly among those which are the most calculated to send me with thankfulness to this unfailing source of strength. To address men upon matters connected with their own eternal interests, is, as you, my reverend brethren, continually experience, a sufficiently anxious task. But to speak to those who are to such an extent charged with the eternal interests of others, to counsel and to admonish them upon matters connected with their high and arduous duties—this is an office of still deeper anxiety, and gives a momentous importance to the speaker's words, which may well make him tremble as he utters them. But it is our comfort, as I have said, to know in our several places in the Church, that her great Head can not only give light and strength to His ministers for the various offices which He assigns to them, but that, in whatever degree, for His wise purposes for ourselves and others, He may keep us dark and weak, he can still use and bless our ministrations to advance His highest ends. In addressing the congregations committed to your care, you, I doubt not, my brethren, are often enabled to lose all painful sense of your

own weakness, in the remembrance that He who is in the midst of those who are assembled in His name, can bring your feeblest words with power to their hearts. I trust we still enjoy that presence which we have so lately acknowledged. And, conscious though I am that I shall speak to you most defectively upon the important subjects which the occasion admonishes me to bring before you, I would yet desire to speak in humble confidence, that He will supply my manifold deficiencies, and make all that I say promote His glory and the good of His Church.

In such addresses as that which I am about to deliver, nothing which concerns the state and prospects of the Church, or the duties of her ministers, can be regarded as out of place, at any time. But, of course, in ordinary Visitations, the latter subject is seldom spoken of, except in the way and degree in which something new in the former makes it necessary to advert to it. There is, I am sure, much in our present condition to account for, and to justify the introduction of such topics. But I must claim the indulgence which seems fairly to belong to a first occasion of this kind, to enlarge more upon such matters, and to dwell more upon elementary points, than I shall probably feel it necessary to do upon any future occasion,—if future occasions of the kind are in store for me.

The reports of the Rural Deans—to whom I desire to return thanks for the important aid which I have received from their labours—have supplied me with fuller and more exact information concerning the state of the united Dioceses, than I could have acquired, in so short a time, without their assistance. And it might be expected, that the details of the proper business of the Visitation, in taking me through these Reports, would furnish abundant opportunities for communicating to you my views on the various points connected with the ministerial office and its duties, on which I might wish to speak. But such occasions would bring out these views irregularly,

Printed 13 D 63



and only to individuals,—on some points to one, and on some to another. So that, however valuable they are, they do not dispense with the necessity of occupying your time at the outset, with such a general address as I have prepared you for.

I might be restrained from dwelling at any length upon the ministerial office and its duties,—if not indeed from entering upon them at all,—when I see around me so many whose large and long experience makes the place of teachers in such matters, much more suitable to them than that of learners. But they will be among the first, I doubt not, to consider, that if I apportioned what I have to say to their experience, I should be omitting a great deal which the inexperience of others may render needful or useful to them. And, besides, so much of what is most elementary, and what has been long regarded as most fixed, has been unsettled in our times, that there is scarcely any point, whether of doctrine or discipline, upon which it is not doubtful what views and principles men now hold. So that there is hardly anything so elementary, or so certain, upon which it may not be necessary to say something, to correct or to determine the views of some who hear me, and, even beyond what that purpose requires, to make known my own.

I. And beginning with externals,—I cannot but express my satisfaction at the general order and regularity with which the public services of the Church, are performed throughout these united Dioceses. I have reason to believe that they are conducted generally with the gravity and propriety which becomes such solemn exercises, and with a strict adherence to appointed forms. Such strict adherence to our appointed forms, is, I need not say, a clear and imperative duty upon us, from the special obligations which we have contracted with respect to them. But I hope such bonds sit lightly upon those whom I address. I trust it is a duty which is rendered easy to you, my reverend brethren, not only by general allegiance to the authority prescribing them, but by a cordial preference for the forms prescribed.

Our Church describes the house of God as “a place appointed by the Holy Scriptures, where the lively word of God ought to be read, taught, and heard; the Lord’s holy name called upon by public prayer; hearty thanks given to His Majesty for his infinite and unspeakable

benefits bestowed upon us; His Holy sacraments duly and reverently administered.”\* And what it ought to be, that she certainly has endeavoured to make it.

As to the first, she is not content with the testimony which she bears to the *sufficiency of Holy Scripture* in her Articles; and with the solemn declaration which she exacts from those whom she appoints to teach and to rule—from her Priests and Bishops—of their entire agreement with her in this fundamental truth, and of their determination to regulate by it all their instructions to the people committed to their charge. She, moreover, in her Homilies, earnestly exhorts even the most unlearned to make themselves acquainted with the sacred volume, testifying, that “unto a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture, forasmuch as in it is contained God’s true word, setting forth his glory, and also man’s duty. And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is, or may be drawn out of that fountain and well of truth. Therefore as many as be desirous to enter into the right and perfect way unto God, must apply their minds to know Holy Scripture; without the which they can neither sufficiently know God and his will, neither their office and duty.”\*

\* \* For in Holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God’s hands at length. \* \* \* These books therefore ought to be much in our hands, in our eyes, in our ears, in our mouths, but most of all, in our hearts. For the Scripture of God is the heavenly meat of our souls; the hearing and keeping of it maketh us blessed, sanctifieth us, and maketh us holy; it turneth our souls, it is a light lantern to our feet; it is a sure, steadfast, and everlasting instrument of salvation, it giveth wisdom to the humble and lowly hearts; it comforteth, maketh glad, cheereth and cheriseth our conscience. \* \* The words of Holy Scripture be called words of everlasting life: for they be God’s instrument ordained for the same purpose. They have power to turn through God’s promise, and they be effectual, through God’s assistance, and (being received in

\* Homily against Peril of Idolatry.

a faithful heart) they have ever an heavenly, spiritual working in them. \* \* And there is nothing that so much strengtheneth our faith and trust in God, that so much keepeth up innocency and pureness of the heart, and also of outward godly life and conversation, as continual reading and recording of God's word. \* \* \* And, moreover, the effect and virtue of God's word is to illuminate the ignorant, and to give more light unto them that faithfully and diligently read it, to comfort their hearts, and to encourage them to perform that which of God is commanded."\*

Such is a part of the testimony which our Church bears, to the excellency of Holy Scripture, and to the duty which rests upon all of acquainting themselves with it. And she shews the sincerity of these fervent praises of God's word, and of her persuasive exhortations to ALL to read it, by giving it such a place in her public services as it has in no other;—not merely permitting the use of Holy Scripture to all her members, and solemnly and earnestly pressing upon all its use in private; but, in public, providing that all who assemble in the house of God, shall hear Him teaching in His holy word, both in the Old Testament and in the New, again and again, as often as they assemble in His house. For this honour done unto God in His word—which doubtless has brought down, and will continue to bring down, a blessing upon her from Him who has declared, *Them that honour me, I will honour*—for this honour to God's word, and for the provision made thereby to teach the people infallibly out of it *the whole counsel of God*, independently of the defects, and errors, and reserves, which are incident to the human teaching that they receive, we ought, I am sure, to be thankful, if we had nothing else in her public services to rejoice in, and to return thanks for.

But there is much—much in what she has done in the matter of prayer. And I trust that we do feel thankful in some measure as we ought, that, *when we assemble and meet together, to acknowledge our sins before God; to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at his hands: to set forth his most worthy praise: and to ask those things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the*

*soul*; our people are not left to gaze upon their minister, addressing God on their behalf in a tongue which they do not understand; not made dependent for the utterance of their sorrows and their fears, their wants and their desires, upon the varying gifts of the ministers assigned to them, or those fluctuations of spirits, and temper, and feelings, to which the most gifted are liable; but that, both for people and for minister, are provided confessions, and thanksgivings, and supplications, which express all that repentance, and gratitude, and need, can desire to express, with such fulness and such simplicity, such fervor and such sobriety, such earnestness and such submissiveness; in a spirit so meek, and chastened, and holy, so humble, and so confiding.

And finally, as to the holy Sacraments. She not only gives them to us in their purity and integrity,—uncorrupted, and unmaimed,—but she has provided services for the celebration of them, which for tenderness, and solemnity, and spirituality, are (if we may say it of what man has written) not much unworthy of their high and holy theme.

I trust that we in a measure value as we ought these great and singular blessings. And I trust that those who have the privilege of officiating in such services among us, bring into the administration of them enough of the spirit which belongs to the season, and the place, and the occupation, to secure that nothing shall be seen in their ministrations, which does harmonize with the devout and reverent spirit in which all our public offices are conceived.

The Editors of Mr. Froude's Remains have thought fit to preserve a conversational sneer of his at 'young parsons' 'who have got into the way of *performing the service impressively*;'\* and another couched in the felicitous phrase, for its purpose, of '*preaching the prayers*.'† Both, I believe, like many others which they have thought worthy of publication, have done more to introduce evil than to correct it. Pithy sayings, which sound acute or refined, will always have irresistible attractions for numbers, including not a few who are not very capable of making a discreet use of them. And they offer so compendious a mode of settling

\* Vol. i. p. 436. He is reported to have added: 'I do not suppose the Catholic service could be performed impressively.'

† Ibid, p. 435.

\* Homily of the Knowledge of Holy Scripture.



what it would be troublesome to settle regularly; that when they obtain currency, they are sure to be mercilessly used. And I believe that these phrases, so far as they have had any effect, have done something to introduce a dry and cold, which in some hands must degenerate into a negligent and irreverent, tone, in reading the services of the Church. It is very plain, however, that it is only under a great mistake of what might be a true sense and proper application of such phrases, that they are allowed to produce such an effect. A deliberate attempt to produce an impression upon a congregation by the tone and manner in which a minister addresses prayers to God, is very leniently treated when it is condemned as bad taste. It is doubtless vile taste, but it is something very much worse too. But to assume a tone and manner unsuited to the sentiments to which we are giving utterance, in order to escape such censure, and avoid giving such offence, is, to say the very least, just as bad in point of taste and feeling. We may justly be offended—we cannot but be much offended—when we see, or imagine, that a man is aiming at being impressive in such a case,—but to be offended with his being impressive, would be to be offended with him for feeling as he ought, what he is addressing to God, and for allowing his feelings to appear, without putting any artificial restraints upon them. For any man who does this in reading our services, (unless he labour under some special physical disqualifications) must be impressive;—not in the way of striking a congregation as impressive, but of imparting to them the feelings by which he himself is moved. I hope, therefore, that you will not be driven by any such scoffs, into that hardness and deadness, which are now sometimes assumed, and which contrast so painfully with the earnestness, and solemnity, and cordiality, of the tone of our public prayers; and which, moreover, are so calculated to damp the spirit of devotion in those whose petitions you are offering.

Those who think that in such services the minister is performing an office *for* the people, rather than *with* them, may very consistently disregard such an effect. And indeed those who appear to look back with some measure of regret at the change made at the Reformation from the Latin services, may hail it as a step taken towards the recovery of what we have

lost, when the prayers are delivered, so as *not to be heard and understood by the people*. But he who cordially enters into the character of our service, as one in which minister and people are to join together in worship, will be under no temptation by posture, tone, or manner, to offer any impediment in the way of his people's addressing God with him, as they were intended to do, *praying with the spirit, and praying with the understanding also*.

And in leaving this head, I must express my satisfaction in believing, that there is no need that I should administer any caution to you against those singularities in dress, and gesture, and posture, which one hears of from time to time, as introduced by individual ministers,—but apparently with a kind of concert,—into the services of the Church in the sister country. I am happy to believe, that in these Dioceses there is no trace of such mischievous fopperies. If they appeared in ordinary times, they might only deserve to be censured as individual frivolities; exhibitions of that uneasy vanity, which in common life leads those who are harassed by a craving for distinction, and who have no better mode of attaining it, to seek it by eccentricities in dress, or equipage, or deportment; only more reprehensible as appearing in God's ministers, and in His house, and in His solemn service. But ours are no ordinary times. We live in times when the design of UNPROTESTANTIZING THE NATIONAL CHURCH has been openly avowed, as the great aim of the most active party in the Church; and when, even in a quarter where the designs of the party are most cautiously spoken of, the Church of Rome is represented, not only as possessing much that is Catholic in common with ourselves, but not a little also, of which the Reformation has divested us, and which it is confessed, there is a *longing to re-appropriate*. When such is our position, and when these novelties in externals are brought forward by the party who have already done so much, and who publish their determination to do whatever more may be necessary, to accomplish what they at last avow to be their great end; and when, finally, these innovations have a manifest tendency to assimilate us in externals with the Church of Rome—when such is the case, I do not think that any one who does not share in this design and desire to promote it, can consistently imitate any of the

practices to which I have referred. And it is, as I said, with unmingled satisfaction, that I find that no disposition has been evinced among us, to commit any of these irregular re-appropriations; or to adopt any of these devices, novel or obsolete, for the decoration or dedecoration of sacred edifices, and those who minister in them.

II. Upon the subject of parochial visiting, I should have a great deal to say, if I did not hope that all my hearers were deeply convinced of its value and necessity. But I am sure that all so feel, and that many of you by experience know its importance both to yourselves and to your flocks. It not only acquaints the clergyman with much in human nature generally, which he would know but very imperfectly, if at all, if he only saw it in the forms in which it meets him in the ordinary intercourse of social life; but it gives him the means of knowing the state of feeling and the peculiarities of character, moral and intellectual, of the individuals to whom he has to minister—their difficulties in apprehension,—their difficulties in practice,—their most formidable temptations,—their besetting sins. And while thus it enables him to adapt his public teaching to their capacities, and condition, and wants, in a way, at least to a degree, which would be impracticable, without the knowledge that it gives;—it affords opportunities of bringing home that teaching in private, to each, with an adaptation to individual peculiarities which cannot be given to what is delivered from the pulpit; which, even when it is most searching and detailed, must always assume so much of the form of a general address, as to allow a man at times, whether through dulness, or deceitfulness of heart, to escape the self-application even of what every one else sees to be most directly applicable to his state. And, besides all this, it gives opportunities for administering to his flock, counsel in their perplexities, and comfort in their afflictions; at once of doing them immediate good, and establishing that kindly relation with them which is so useful in procuring an open ear for all his future teaching, public and private.

But though parochial visiting is capable of yielding these signal advantages, and others too of the same kind, yet it is not to be disguised that it is hard to draw them from it. Some positions throw more difficulties in the way of making it an effective instrument to its end, than

others. In towns, for example, speaking generally, the difficulties are greater, often far greater, than in the country. But I intend only to notice one general difficulty which affects all places, and which all therefore have to encounter. I mean the difficulty of pursuing at once steadily and discreetly, what ought to be the great aim of this, as of every part of your ministry, —the spiritual welfare of those given to you in charge. Most of those whom you visit are so much more occupied and interested by time than by eternity, that while they will gladly and freely talk about the one, it is very hard to engage them in any practical and profitable conversation about the other. Now to deal with this tendency wisely and tenderly, so as not to give way too much to it, and not to resist it too much, is of course a matter of difficulty. One who suffers himself to be carried away unresistingly by the current of the feelings and interests of those whom he visits, will give a worldly and unprofitable tone to his calls. One who does not lend himself at all to the subjects that fill their minds, will bring in his own subjects with grievous disadvantages. He will be regarded as a hard man, who takes no interest in what most nearly touches them. Or if they do not pass any such formal judgment upon him, he will practically put himself out of all sympathy and communion with them. And when once that is the case, all that he says, whether in public or private, is likely to fall upon unwilling ears. It would be a point of wisdom, therefore, if it were no more, that a minister should take an interest in what most interests those to whom he desires to give higher objects. But no doubt it is a point of right feeling too. For certainly the Lord never seems to have been restrained from feeling, and showing, sympathy in men's bodily wants and sufferings, by the fact, which He best knew, and felt most deeply, that their souls stood in need of His higher ministrations. And, following out fairly the example which He sets us in this matter, it would seem as if all who minister to others, and especially among the poor, should have an ear and a heart for all, even their most trivial distresses and anxieties, and cares. And if it is very difficult to unite due attention to their temporal concerns with a proper care of their eternal interests, I suppose the difficulty arises in a good measure from something defective or wrong in the state of our feelings, with respect to one of the objects,



or perhaps both,—and, that more would be done to surmount the difficulty, by bringing ourselves into a right state of feeling, and trusting to its operation under the direction of moderate discretion in each case, than by devising any artificial rules for the general regulation of visiting. If we feel as we ought for men's temporal interests, we will always be able without effort to enter cordially into their worldly anxieties, and hopes, and sorrows, and joys. And if we have the predominant solicitude about their souls which we ought to have, we shall not be in danger of suffering these minor concerns to shut their higher interests out from their proper place in our communications with them;—we shall be prepared, naturally, and without effort, to take advantage of all the opportunities which such kindly communications about the things of time may present to us, of leading to the things of eternity. And such opportunities cannot fail often to arise; far oftener indeed when their natural feelings are thus indulged, than if they were chilled and repressed by want of sympathy. For in such unrestrained intercourse, character exhibits itself without disguise, and while we are never likely to see men's weaknesses more clearly, we can never be in a more favourable condition to advise and admonish them, upon any excess of anxiety about this world which they exhibit, or any want of principle into which it seems likely to lead them, than when we are giving them a practical proof of the real interest that we take in what agitates and engrosses them.

III. Upon the subject of Education I need say but little. In fact, the questions in theory which the subject naturally suggests, and the practical question which the peculiar circumstances of this country present, have been too long before the minds of the ministers of our Church, and under too pressing a necessity for coming to a judgment upon them, and acting upon it, to allow me to suppose, that there are many who have still their opinions to form upon them. And it is the more unnecessary for me to speak at large upon them here, because we have very lately laid before both Houses of Parliament a Petition, in which our views upon the subject were distinctly stated. And it was very satisfactory to find that there was sufficient unity of judgment and feeling among us upon this very important point, to enable us to join (with scarcely a single dissident in the united

Dioceses) in the same representation to the Legislature, of the position in which we felt ourselves placed by the system of United Education, which exists in this country—of the principles upon which we felt obliged to act with respect to it—and of the great difficulties and disadvantages, which, in consequence, we laboured under, in the discharge of one of our clearest and most important duties.

The prayer which we founded upon these statements was not granted. Nor could we perhaps be reasonably disappointed at finding, that such a pressure of business as the Government and Parliament had to deal with last Session, should (upon the common principles which determine the precedence of public questions) have prevented the consideration of a subject, which could not be discussed, whether it were settled or not, but at some cost of time. But, as we asked for no more than a careful consideration of the question, with a view to its re-adjustment on sounder principles,—and, in thus limiting the prayer of our petition, as well as in its general principles, we had the general concurrence of the other dioceses, which petitioned Parliament on the subject,—and as the question offers itself to the Government, and to Parliament, in such a shape as plainly to call for such revision, we may hope that in the next session we may obtain what we have asked for; and that in the issue of such deliberations our anomalous and disadvantageous position may find some remedy.

Meanwhile, it is our clear duty to go on as we have begun, to make such provision as the limited means which we can command allow, for the establishment and maintenance of schools, which bear testimony to the great principle of Scriptural Education, for which we have been contending, and which also make provision for training our own children in an acquaintance with the principles of our Church, under the direction of her ministers, and through her authorized formularies. It is much to be regretted, that the fruits of the exertions hitherto made have fallen so very far short of the demands of the case. But they are sufficient to encourage us to continue, and to increase, our exertions to make the claims of these schools better known and more deeply felt.

It cannot be necessary to say that the best religious instruction which can be combined with general education in your parish-schools through the week, ought

never to dispense with the additional training which you may give on the Sabbath, to those who are more especially commended to your care, and placed under your direction. Indeed, the advantages to be derived from the regular catechising of the young, and from the more extended Scriptural instruction which Sunday-schools may be made the instrument of imparting, to those who are capable of receiving it, are too well understood to make it necessary or excusable to dwell long upon them. And I have no thought of doing so. But I cannot leave the subject of Education, without saying a single word upon this very important part of it.

Every parish minister has had from time to time to lament the ignorance of the principles of our Church, under which its humbler members so often labour, and their consequent inability to defend themselves from the arts by which the constancy of their attachment to it is assailed. Every one so engaged has also had to mourn over the ignorance of Scripture, which is so common among the same classes, and which leaves them so often, not much less defenceless as Christians, than they are as Churchmen. With us, danger from infidelity may be rare, but unhappily that from dissent is very common. But I need not say, that it is but a small part of the train of evils which such ignorance brings with it, that it leaves men exposed to such dangers. I do not mean, however, to enlarge on these consequences, or indeed to speak of any of them but one; which is, that it almost puts men beyond the reach of instruction from the pulpit. To minds unfurnished with the knowledge of Scripture, and unexercised about it, even very plain and direct preaching will present great difficulties. And if there were no other motive to the diligent and regular catechising of the young; and the instructing in the same way in Holy Scripture generally, of those who are of age to receive more extended instruction; than this, that it is the only mode of making them in after-life members of the Church, attached to her communion intelligently and on principle, and capable of profiting by the public teaching of her ministers,—if this were the only fruit to be hoped for from it, the duty would well deserve all the time and all the labour which are needed for the effective discharge of it.

IV. And this brings me to the last point which I think it necessary to notice

in the duties of your important office—your public preaching. Though I have come to it last, in many important respects I cannot hesitate to assign to it the highest place among the duties of a minister. It is, no doubt, best discharged in conjunction with those parts of the pastoral office of which I have been speaking. Indeed, perhaps it can never be discharged effectively except in such combination. While on the other hand it will be collected from what I have been saying, that I regard the other branches of the pastoral office as performing one of their most important functions, when they are thus making preparation for, and seconding, the public addresses of the minister. But without entering too far into the subject, I may remind you that there is this to distinguish your labours in the pulpit from all others, that they are exclusively your own. In other parts of your work you may, and if your sphere be an extended one, you must, owe much to the aid of others. In relieving the sick and indigent, you will have to resort, not merely to the contributions of your flock, but to the personal agency of the active and benevolent, in distributing the funds which have been thus provided for you. And not merely in such kindly offices to those committed to your care, but even in instructing them, you may owe much to the like assistance. And such an employment of qualified auxiliaries, if kept under proper direction by a minister, may be eminently useful to the teachers, as well as to the taught. Many a minister sees a crowded Sunday School break up, with the happy feeling, that the duty of training the young committed to his care, *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*, has not been neglected, who would be obliged to look with very different thoughts, upon this interesting and important portion of his flock, if they had been left entirely to what he could do, unaided, for them. And so by the aid of others, a man may be filling effectively a sphere of action, in which he would be toiling without hope, if he were deprived of such assistance. But in the pulpit you must stand alone. The members of your congregation who may do much with you and for you elsewhere, can neither represent nor assist you there. When you enter the pulpit, you leave all such auxiliaries behind you. And if you descend from it with the feeling that your people have been imperfectly taught, rebuked, or exhorted by you, you cannot have the



consolation, which in other cases you may in some degree enjoy, that your deficiencies have been supplied by others.

If the deficiencies of which you are conscious be from a want of natural powers, our Lord is not the austere Master that wicked and slothful servants sometimes represent him to themselves.—He does *not* reap where he has not sown, nor gather where he has not strawed; and you may be at peace as regards Him, and the account which you are to render to Him. Even for his flock, when such is the cause of his deficiencies, the preacher may hope, that He *who has used the foolish things of this world, to confound the wise; and weak things of the world, to confound the mighty*, will employ his feeble ministry to baffle Satan's craft, and to pull down his strong-holds. But if the deficiencies of his sermon have arisen from this—that the time and thought which it required, have not been spent upon it, the case is far different. Even when he knows that the time which he has taken from preparation for the pulpit, has been spent in parochial labours,—and I desire to consider no other cause of want of due preparation,—I think he must feel that, without comparing the duties in any other point of view, he has been sacrificing the one in which his failure affects the greatest numbers, and in which case it is least capable of being remedied or supplied.

And although I do not mean to pursue the comparison at any length, I cannot avoid saying, further, that I think that it is in the pulpit, that a minister appears most distinctly and impressively in his office as *God's ambassador*. He ought never to lose sight of this office, even in his *teaching from house to house*. Everywhere, and under all circumstances, he ought to be ready, in this character, to take advantage of all opportunities which may offer themselves to him, of *beseeking men to be reconciled to God*. But I need not say that there are many and serious impediments to the exercise of the duty elsewhere: and that *the word of reconciliation* committed to him, would find in private, not merely many a heedless, but many an impatient hearer. But there is none of the same kind of impatience, when it is delivered from the pulpit. Men feel that they are assembled to hear it. And, to say nothing of what it owes, when so delivered, to earnestness, and solemnity, and fervour, and other accessories, which naturally belong to a public

address, but which are not easily connected with the more familiar style of private teaching, it falls from the pulpit upon ears which are in some measure prepared to hear it,—which at least are not closed against it by the feeling that it is out of place. And if it be true that it is in the pulpit that a preacher of the word best and most effectively discharges this most important part of his office, it must be felt that it offers even more obvious advantages for the exercise of other parts; that it is there that he can *reprove, rebuke, and exhort*, with the fullest weight of ministerial authority; and in a tone which could not be employed to individuals, without defeating its own object. And these are such clear and such important distinctions that I need not advert to any other.

I might end here what I had to say about this part of your duties, but that it is one of the points to which I referred, upon which studious attempts have been made to change the views and feelings of ministers in recent times. Preaching has been systematically disparaged, and even expressly described as an instrument which 'may be necessary in a weak and languishing state' [of the Church], but one which 'Scripture, to say the least, has never much recommended'! \* I will not do so much wrong to your acquaintance with Scripture, as to set about any regular exposure of this hardy misrepresentation of it. You will need no proof that you are *to teach publicly*, as well as *from house to house*; *to preach the word*; *to do the work of an Evangelist*; and that in 'preaching,' you are using an instrument which God has appointed, and employed, and honoured, and blessed, in bringing sinners to Christ, and building them up in the faith. And what I have said, had not for its purpose to prove this to you, but to draw attention to a few out of the many considerations which serve to show the high and peculiar importance of this branch of your duties. I hope, few as they were, they were sufficient for their purpose; which was, to procure for this part of your office the place which it ought to hold in your estimation; and this, that it may in practice receive the measure of attention which it requires. For it is a great work,

\* Tract 87, p. 75:—'Not that we would be thought *entirely* to depreciate preaching as a mode of doing good: it may be necessary, &c.'

which can only be carried on successfully when a minister gives himself to it,—studies, thinks, and prays over it.

When I speak, however, of the study and labour which right preparation for the pulpit requires; I am far from intending that their aim should be graces of style, or any of the artifices of composition. For the general purposes of addresses from the pulpit, I am sure that *simplicity* and *directness* are above every artificial ornament; and that when *seriousness* and *cordiality* are combined with them, they leave nothing to be desired in a sermon, as regards what is generally meant by *style*. And they are within the reach of every one; and indeed are rather to be regarded as the natural result of a right state of mind and feeling about the momentous subjects of your discourses, and about those to whom they are addressed, than as qualities to be bestowed on a composition, as the fruit of special effort in every particular case.

With respect to arrangement, somewhat more direct labour may be required—particularly in some cases. For there are some persons in whom arrangement seems plainly a natural gift—who not only naturally, as it seems, express themselves so clearly that each separate thought is easily understood by the very plainest hearers; but who, with as little apparent effort, arrange their thoughts in the way most favourable for taking in, and retaining the entire. Some, on the other hand, labour under natural disadvantages in both respects. But a deficiency in powers of arrangement is, I believe, the more common. At least one not unfrequently hears a preacher who frames his sentences, so that each conveys with sufficient clearness what was intended; and yet there is such a want of connexion between them, as they succeed each other, and the parts into which it would be natural to divide what he says, are disposed so little according to their sequence and dependence in the order of thought, that to understand the whole scope and purpose of his discourse requires more mental effort than his humbler hearers are able, or his more cultivated hearers disposed, to make. If a preacher keeps his hearers in this sort of puzzle, while he is speaking, and if, when all is over, the perplexity still remains, they will be likely to get into the habit of acquiescing in this state, and be satisfied with taking away a stray thought or two,

giving up all effort to understand his discourse as a whole.

Such a result is sufficiently unhappy to make it well worth while for those who can only attain to clearness of arrangement by pains and thought, to take all the trouble about it which they find necessary to ensure it. And I suppose no one is likely to excuse himself from such labour by saying, That his hearers know nothing about method, and that they would not know whether his discourses were well or ill arranged. This would be to mistake entirely the whole case. The nature and objects of method are wholly misunderstood, when it is supposed to be something which is intended to attract attention to itself,—to be an object of admiration, or a source of pleasure to a man's hearers. It will, of course, always exhibit itself to competent persons, who take the pains of analyzing any skilful composition; and will be perceived, without any effort, by one whose mind has been much exercised, and whose attention is much awake, about such matters. But its excellence lies in being felt, not seen. It is but means to the end, of rendering it easy to hearers to take in and retain a discourse; and the less that it is perceived, the more is it fitted to answer its end. So that it would be a total mistake to estimate its importance in a particular case by the degree in which it, or the want of it, was noticed by your hearers. It is little likely to be observed by uneducated persons, and the want of it just as little. But it makes itself felt by all, and the want of it is felt by all too. Indeed, the case is even stronger. For those who would most readily perceive defects in arrangement, are the very persons who can most easily dispense with the aid which good arrangement gives. And it is those who are least capable of perceiving such defects, who are sure to suffer from them most. So that for the sake more especially of those very congregations in which your want of method is least likely to be detected and complained of, the arrangement of your discourses requires peculiar attention. It will require, as I said, very much more care and labour from some than from others. But it deserves all that it may require from all.

But when I spoke of study and labour, I was thinking much more of the materials of your discourses, than of their composition. For a man who preaches much, without from time to time renew-



ing the stock of matter with which he began his career, however sound or pious he may continue to be, will be almost sure ultimately to become a very barren preacher. And I only say *almost*, in consideration of a few rare instances, in which observation of life, and intercourse with varieties of character, seem to make an original and peculiar cast of mind, independent in a good measure of reading. But these are rare exceptions. Generally, and all but universally, a public teacher requires to have his own mind supplied and exercised by books. And to derive full advantage from them, I need hardly say, that he must not only read, but think. Undigested reading is better, I am sure, than none. I know that a different opinion is entertained by some, but this is mine. For there is no one who does not take away some matter from what he reads, and no mind can be so inert as not to be forced to some activity, while taking in new facts or thoughts. And, what is not to be put out of view, every mind becomes continually more unfurnished and more inert, when reading is wholly given up. But the benefit to be derived from reading without purpose and thought, of course falls far short of that which reflection will draw from the same, or from scantier stores. And this applies very particularly to the most fruitful, as well as the most important of the sources from which the preacher's materials are to be drawn. By reading the Holy Scriptures, without meditating upon them, a man may no doubt obtain considerable acquaintance with the facts and doctrines which they contain,—may become an adroit controversialist, and a well-furnished textuary. But, unless he studies the sacred volume with patient thought (I need not add to you, my brethren,—with earnest prayer,) until he becomes imbued with its spirit, as well as acquainted with its contents, his use of Scripture will be comparatively jejune, and cold, and unprofitable. And so, you remember, the Apostle exhorts his beloved son in the faith:—"MEDITATE upon these things—give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." And, certainly, all do feel the difference which there is between one who is giving out crude materials, taken in hastily for the occasion, and one who is drawing from the stores which he has laid up in this meditative study of Divine truth.

One who thus studies the whole sacred

volume patiently and reverently, has this important advantage as a teacher—to note but one out of very many—that he will be able, and disposed too, to present the whole body of truth which it contains in juster proportions, than one who reads it by fits and starts, in such parts as passing curiosity, or a passing exigency, offers to him. Such patient study of the whole of Revelation is, in many cases, necessary to correct the tendency to distort and exaggerate, which is so often the result of the study of human systems of theology, even of those which are in all main points sound. They are all in this, at least, marked with the imperfection of their source, even when they show no clearer indications of it, that they present some portions of the divine scheme,—not in entire neglect of the remaining parts—but in undue prominence with respect to them. And, even if our view of revelation be drawn, not from any of these human systems, but directly from the Bible, we ought to bear in mind, that it is of the nature of a human system, and that it is liable to this displacement of the features of Divine truth at the first. And, supposing that we can be sure that we have guarded against this, in forming it, still, when we carry it into use, it is liable to contract this fault, unless we are constantly readjusting every part of it, by bringing it again and again to the word of God—not as if we continually apprehended that it needed to be freed from some fundamental error,—this would be to lead a life of pyrrhonism, not of faith,—but to secure it from such derangement of its parts as may disturb their proper relation, whether as auxiliary or antagonist powers—such a gradual development of particular portions, and neglect of others, as may, by an imperceptible, but sure process, destroy the harmony and perfection of the whole.

Such undue developments of particular portions of divine truth, if we descend to their minuter features, are of course as various as men's intellects, and tastes, and habits, and circumstances. But our object makes us concerned only with broader distinctions. And, viewing these varieties in this way, very many, if not all of them, fall under two great divisions: one being formed of all those in which the Lord's Atonement appears with too little reference to His example; and the other, of those in which His example is inculcated with too little reference to His Atonement. I may say at the outset,

that I do not mean to include in the former class that extreme in which the necessity of taking Christ as our example, and aiming at being like Him, is denied;—which is what is generally understood by Antinomianism. While from the latter class I mean to exclude the extreme which denies the doctrine of the Atonement altogether;—which is Socinianism. I mean, however, to comprehend in the former division, all cases in which the Atonement is preached distinctly and fully, but in which—while it is acknowledged that those who receive the doctrine ought, and are bound, to obey and imitate Him who has wrought this reconciling work,—yet this obligation is not stated with due distinctness, nor are proper pains taken to press the duty upon them in detail. While, on the other hand, I mean to comprehend in the other class, all the cases where (while the Atonement is acknowledged) the life of Christ is sought to be produced independently of belief in it, and by other motives than those which it supplies.

Now that both these are unscriptural systems, I need not say: and that both therefore are to be avoided, I need not say. But I do not wish to conceal that I think the latter far the worse and more deadly error. The former sets out upon the principle that all Christian practice is to be derived from Christian faith—which is a certain and fundamental truth—more or less denied by the latter. It infers then that if we can implant true faith, Christian practice will follow: on the principle, that if we can produce the cause, *it* will produce the effect; and that therefore we need not make this any object of our care and exertion. But however true the abstract principle is, it ought to be remembered in every application of it, that what is usually called *the* cause, is not the sole cause in any such sense as not to require the concurrence of various subordinate causes, in order that it should produce its full effects; sometimes that it should produce any effect at all. And that, further, all moral causes at least, not only require to be directed and regulated, but to be developed and strengthened by exercise. And to come to the particular case with which we are concerned: it is true that a man cannot really believe in Christ without loving Him, or love Him without a desire to please Him. But to labour to implant the principle of faith in Christ in the heart, and to leave it then, without endeavouring to direct and control,

and stimulate, and exercise it,—is not merely to neglect what all that we know of the human mind shows to be essential to the full development and efficiency of every such principle, but,—what is of still more consequence than any such error in mental philosophy,—it is running counter to all the examples of divine teaching, which we have in the word of God. And in thus abandoning the duty of a teacher, the minister not only, as far as in him lies, stunts and dwarfs the principle of faith when it is really in the heart, but he helps sinners to delude themselves with the persuasion that it is in the heart when it really is not—by putting out of view the safeguard against such self-deception which the wisdom of God has provided, in the requirements of His Word.

Such a course is doubtless to be condemned and avoided. But still, as I said before, I do not think it so preposterous or so presumptuous as the attempt to build up the Christian character, without first laying the foundation in the belief of this truth. Indeed as to the real presumption of this procedure—when one considers the nature of the truth which it is proposed to set aside, and all that is declared in Scripture of its place in the divine plan for saving sinners, one can hardly find language to characterize the faithless temerity of thus dealing with it. But in what I have said I have meant to speak of the moral influence of this great doctrine, leaving out all consideration of its saving efficacy, any further than that is necessarily involved in any consideration of its moral influences. And limiting our view as exclusively as possible to the latter, I mean to say, that one who preaches the doctrine of the Atonement clearly and fully, while he neglects the moral training which ought to accompany it, is infinitely less likely to preach in vain, than the man who seeks to carry on this training, without doing any thing to set forth and secure belief in that doctrine. Just as—and I trust that the propriety of the comparison will be felt by all who hear me—just as one who sows good seed, while he neglects the other duties of the husbandman, is more likely to have a crop, than he who performs all these offices, with the greatest possible exactness and diligence, while he neglects to sow the seed.

Bishop Butler remarks, that it is one of the weaknesses of our nature, when, upon a comparison of two things, one is



found to be of greater importance than the other, to consider this other as of scarce any importance at all. And there is evidently the danger from the same weakness, that a comparison of two things, which shows one to be more objectionable than the other, may abate unduly our dread of the latter. I am not insensible to this danger: and I trust it will appear, that I have not wantonly incurred it on the present occasion.

This mode of discharging the duties of a preacher, by attempting to carry on Christian training, without laying the foundation in Christian faith, has been recently advocated very strenuously, and very perseveringly. It was distinctly put forward and supported in one of the *Tracts for the Times*; \* and after an interval of nearly three years, the attempt was renewed in another of that series of publications, which have acquired such unhappy celebrity.†

The title of both *Tracts* is, ‘On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge.’ But it is only with the Reserve in communicating the Doctrine of the Atonement, which the writer recommends, that we are now concerned. What that is, I shall enable you to judge, by giving you the statements of his views, in his own words as they are found in the *Tracts*:—It is said, ‘The prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement *explicitly* and *prominently* on all occasions . . . is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture.’ ‡ Indeed, it is said, that ‘In all things it would appear, that this doctrine, so far from its being what is supposed, is, in fact, the very “secret of the Lord,” which Solomon says is with the righteous, and “the covenant” not to be lightly spoken of by man, but which “He will show to them that fear him.”’ § And it is proposed to account for ‘The cause of the extraordinary prevalence of this modern opinion of the necessity of preaching the Atonement thus explicitly,’ || as if its prevalence were something so strange as to demand a special explanation. Further, it is said: ‘And not only is the exclusive and naked exposure of so very sacred a truth unscriptural and dangerous, but, as Bishop Wilson says, the comforts of religion ought to be applied with great caution. And moreover to require, as is sometimes

done from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the Atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable.’ \*

Again: ‘With regard to the notion, that it is necessary to bring forward the doctrine of the Atonement on all occasions prominently and exclusively, it is really difficult to say anything in answer to an opinion, however popular, when one is quite at a loss to know on what grounds the opinion is maintained.’ †

Again: “It [its difference from the Scripture mode of teaching] may be observed in this, that this scheme puts knowledge first, and obedience afterwards: let this doctrine, they say, be received, and good works will necessarily follow. Holy Scripture throughout adopts the opposite course.’ And in a note upon this it is said, ‘One instance in Scripture has been applied otherwise: “Make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt.” . . . Is it not a very overstrained interpretation, to apply this to the doctrine of the Atonement, on the supposition that the infinite and incomprehensible love of God manifested therein, will, on being published, powerfully affect men’s minds, and, on being heard, regenerate their souls? Is there any sanction whatever for this in Holy Scripture?’ ‡

\* Tract, p. 78.

† Tract, No. 87, p. 51.

‡ Tract, No. 87, pp. 56, 57. Upon this quotation I think it necessary to make one or two remarks:—1. The system which the writer refers to in making *faith* the source and spring of obedience, does undoubtedly make some kind and degree of *knowledge* precede obedience, just because *faith* requires for its foundation some amount of *knowledge*. In this sense, and to this extent this system does *put knowledge first, and obedience afterwards*. But this, as it ought to be unnecessary to remark, does not presume that knowledge to any amount produces faith, or produces obedience. Nor is it inconsistent in any way with the truth that to other kinds and degrees of knowledge, faith is a key, and that obedience is a key. 2. Upon the very great unfairness of describing “Make the tree good,” &c. as the single text relied on by those whom the writer opposes, it is probably better to say nothing. But as to the use said to be made of it, it may be freely admitted that it is pressed too far, if it be taken to prove anything more than that any attempt at reformation which does not reach the state of the heart from which outward evil proceeds, must be ineffectual. It evidently does not of itself prove that the atonement is the appointed or a proper instrument for effecting this reformation. 3. As to what it said upon that point, however, if ‘on being published,’ and ‘on being

\* Tract, No. 80.

† Tract, No. 87.

‡ Tract, No. 80, p. 75.

§ Tract, p. 76.

|| Ibid. p. 76.



And again: 'To suppose, therefore, that a doctrine so unspeakable and mysterious as that of the Atonement is to be held out to the impenitent sinner to be embraced in some manner to move the affections, is so unlike the Lord's conduct, that it makes one fear for the ultimate consequences of such a system.' \*

I have given so many passages, because I feel it to be very important to fix beyond any reasonable doubt the true object of the Tract, as regards this doctrine. And the more carefully because it is sometimes denied, that the author really intends to discountenance the preaching of the Atonement; or to do anything more than oppose and condemn that exclusive preaching of the doctrine (*i. e.* the preaching of it and nothing else) which I have myself condemned, as at variance with the dictates of right reason and the example of Holy Scripture. And it is very true, that the Tract does denounce the *exclusive* preaching of the doctrine. But it is equally true, that it opposes the *explicit* preaching of it. Some of the sentences in the passages which I have quoted, and elsewhere, are so framed, and, (perhaps through a real confusion between them in the mind of the author,)

heard,' mean that the doctrine is expected, of its own efficacy, and without any exertion of the Spirit's power, to produce this needful change, it is freely admitted that for such an expectation there is no sanction whatever in Holy Scripture. But neither, it is presumed, is there any foundation for representing that it is entertained and acted upon by any class of preachers at the present day. All profess at least to hold that even if Paul were the preacher, the Lord must *open the hearts* of his hearers, or he would preach in vain. And, in fact, I do not believe that any who preach the atonement explicitly, do so under such an expectation of its natural effects. But there are two suppositions which they do make; they suppose that the preaching of Christ, and of His death, and His rising again, by His ministers, is an appointed mode of producing saving faith in Him. And if they be asked for a sanction for this supposition, they would refer, to name one passage out of many, to Rom. x. 4-17. And another supposition on which they rest, is that the *faith* which the Spirit produces *through the hearing of the word of God*, He uses as an instrument in cleansing the sinner's heart, and in enabling him to resist the world and the prince of the world, and in all things to do and to suffer as God requires him. And for this supposition it is presumed that there is abundant Scripture sanction (to adduce again but a few places out of very many) in Acts xv. 9. in Eph. vi. 16. in 1 John v. 4. and in Heb. xi.

\* Tract, No. 87, p. 65.

the exclusive and explicit preaching of the doctrine are mixed together and interchanged in such a way, as might possibly create some doubt in the minds of plain readers, whether more is meant than to condemn the former mode of teaching. But this doubt only applies to some of the passages. In some it must be evident to the very plainest readers, that *any explicit preaching of the doctrine to sinners* is condemned; and indeed in the two last, the hope of moving their affections by such means, is branded as at once dangerous and chimerical.

And in saying this, I am not overlooking what the author himself has said, apparently with the view of disclaiming such a design. His first tract, under this apprehension of its object, drew from various quarters, very strong expressions of disapprobation and alarm. And in adverting in the second tract, to such manifestations of feeling, he gives what seems intended as a disavowal of the purpose ascribed to him. He asks,—'Do we then maintain that it [the doctrine of the Atonement,] is to be intentionally and designedly withdrawn from all public mention?' To which he replies, that he and his friends never suggested or practised any such thing.\* And perhaps such is the case. But this is not what he was charged with. It was not alleged against the tract that it condemned *all public mention of the doctrine*, but that it discountenanced the preaching of it to impenitent sinners to bring them to repentance, and to penitent sinners to confirm them in holiness, that it condemned any preaching which makes this truth the foundation of offers of mercy to sinners,—of invitations to repentance to sinners,—the source of Christian morals to believers,—which makes it the instrument of converting and reforming, of drawing men *to* Christ, and *after* Christ. This is what the writer is charged with. And this is perhaps not inconsistent with the literal truth of his disclaimer. But at all events, no one can read some of the passages which I have read to you, with any degree of fairness and attention, and doubt that the charge is well founded. And if the writer's statements left his purpose in any respect doubtful, the course of the reasoning by which they are sustained must make it perfectly clear.

These arguments which are scattered over the tracts without much regard

\* Tract, No. 87, p. 52.

to order, are drawn from a variety of sources. Philosophy and natural instinct, Scripture and tradition, are all made to combine in enforcing the duty of reserve for which the writer pleads. And he is able to show, apparently to his own perfect satisfaction, that we are contradicting the best established principles of mental philosophy, resisting the right impulses of the nature which God has bestowed upon us, going against the genius and spirit of all Divine teaching, whether in providence or revelation, and more especially rejecting the lesson which is taught us by the example of the blessed Lord himself, and finally opposing the principles of the Catholic Church, when we publish this great mystery to men of unholly lives.

I should be very glad to be able to examine all of these arguments in detail. It is only by such a regular review, that I could hope to convey to you any adequate apprehension of the mass of sophistry and misrepresentation and confusion which have been brought, to sustain the startling positions which I have just read to you. But I could not make such an attempt, without losing sight altogether of the limits within which an address of this kind ought to be confined. Instead therefore of engaging you in an examination of the entire, I shall confine myself to a single division, choosing the arguments which have been drawn from the example of the teaching of our blessed Lord in the course of his earthly ministry. I select those arguments, because, while they are in their own nature the most important, they seem to have been those most relied on in the tract, and they certainly have contributed more to the impression which it has made, than any other which it contains; and moreover they furnish a fair specimen of the general character of the reasoning employed in the divisions which I am obliged to omit.

But in leaving the others to your own examination, I wish to forewarn you of an uncertainty in the use of the principal term, which pervades the entire treatise, at least the important part with which we are concerned, and against which therefore you have need to be continually on your guard. *Reserve* is not merely used for *holding back* certain truths, and *keeping silence* about them, but also for *caution*, and for *discretion*, and for *reverence*, in treating them. And all that the author can find in support of the duty

of reserve, in any of the latter senses, is taken by him, apparently without any doubt, as of no less force to prove it to be a duty in the former sense. This of course makes it easy to establish the rule which he desires to enforce. But it reaches farther; for it apparently makes it fruitless, so far as he is concerned, to reason against it. For when pressed with arguments against his rule of reserve, in one of the senses of the word, he is able to retreat into one of the other senses, in which he is safe from all disturbance.

His first tract, as I said, drew forth much opposition; and by a number of writers, the unsound and unscriptural character of the rule of Reserve, as regarded the Atonement, which he sought to establish, was very clearly exhibited. And then the virtue of this ambiguity appeared. For in his second tract, in adverting to these publications, he regards himself simply as contending for *reverence* in handling divine truths. And, as none of the various writers against his treatise had shown any disposition to question that this is a duty; after all that they had done, he is able to look upon all of them as opponents, who would fain assail his 'principle,' but who find themselves really unable to say anything against it.

But my business is not with the author, but with you. And I hope it may be of some assistance to you in threading the mazes of this very long, very rambling, and very misty treatise, to be forewarned of this special source of confusion, which affects every part of it with which we are concerned,—the statements, the inferences, and the arguments; so that while the practical part is shifting between a recommendation to treat certain great truths with reverence, and a prohibition to put them forward at all, in our public teaching; every argument in favour of the former course is regarded as commending the latter; while every one who opposes the latter—who raises his voice against holding back these great doctrines,—is treated either as arguing against reverence in dealing with them, or as arguing beside the question if he is not.

With this general safeguard, I must leave, as I said, the other arguments to your own examination, and confine myself to that most important class, which the author derives from the RESERVE which characterized the public teaching of the blessed Lord.



This Reserve is said to have pervaded His whole ministry,—to have appeared in the performance of His miracles,—in the mode in which He taught by parables,—and particularly, as bearing most directly on the matter in hand, in His holding back in His public teaching the great truths of His own Divinity and Atonement.

The statements, however, concerning it are at once so exaggerated and so indistinct, that before I proceed further, I find it necessary to remind you of two points, in order that the true nature and extent of the Reserve exercised by the blessed Lord, may not be misunderstood.

I. Whatever be the reserve which He maintained concerning the necessity and efficacy of His sufferings, in order to procure forgiveness for sinners, yet He does distinctly, and without any reserve, from the first to the last of His ministry, declare the necessity and efficacy of faith in Him, in procuring the forgiveness of their sins, and their full acceptance with God. “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: That *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life.” “*He that believeth on him is not condemned*, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” “Verily, verily, I say unto you, *he that believeth on me* hath everlasting life.” “And this is the will of him that sent me, that *every one* which seeth the Son, and *believeth on him*, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” “If ye believe not in me, ye shall die in your sins.” “He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet he shall live: and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.” “This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent.” But I need not go on to multiply quotations. The words which I have given were spoken by him at the very beginning and at the very end of his ministry, as well as at intermediate periods. And you must see that they are abundantly sufficient to show that, upon this point, that is, *upon the necessity and efficacy of faith in Him, to secure a sinner's forgiveness with the Most High*, there was no reserve in the Lord's teaching.

2. In whatever other respects His teaching may be described as a system of reserve, it is nowhere, nor at any time, a system of reserve as regards *the readiness of God to receive, and to pardon the repentant sinner*. And I wish to draw your attention the more particularly to this point, because there is nothing in the preaching of the Atonement at the present day, which raises more hostility and alarm in those who oppose it, than that it presents God as a *God ready to forgive*.

How unreservedly the Lord offers him in this character you know. He presents Him to us as a Lord to whom his servant owed ten thousand talents, and who in wrath commands him to be sold, with his wife and children, and all that he had, that he might pay this great debt; but who, when that servant casts himself at his feet, and supplicates his forbearance, is *moved with compassion, and looses him, and forgives him the debt*. Again, He sets Him before us as a creditor who had two debtors; one owing him an hundred pence, and the other fifty, and who, *when they had nothing to pay, frankly forgave them both*. And you know too how He shows Him to us in the person of the wronged and forsaken father, who sees, *while he is yet a great way off*, the returning prodigal, and runs; and falls on his neck, and kisses him. And when the penitent wanderer asks but the place of a servant, in the home where he had abandoned and forfeited the place of a child; the father calls for a robe, and a ring, and all that could mark his perfect restoration to the full privileges of a freeman, and commands that the house should resound with feasting and joy at the return of his lost son; and the Lord tells us that this joy but shadows forth the rejoicing which fills the courts of heaven, at the return of one repentant sinner to God.

Here is no reserve with respect to an important part of the doctrine of the Atonement; the very part, as I said, which creates most jealousy and alarm, and on account of which chiefly, I presume, the preaching of that doctrine is discountenanced.

Having said this, which I think it most important that you should remember, I shall not stop to examine any of the instances which are alleged as examples and proofs of this reserve. Some of them are fairly alleged in the case; but there is the strangest violence done to Scripture, to wring additional instances

from it when the more obvious ones are exhausted.\* But we are not concerned in looking closely at them, because what they are intended to prove is in a general way to be admitted. It is not to be questioned that the Lord upon several occasions showed a desire to conceal His miracles; that at times he seems to adopt the parabolical form in teaching for the veil which it throws over His meaning; and that in His preaching and teaching, the great truth of His own Divinity and Atonement, seems generally to have been held back.

But it is with the inference from these facts that we are concerned. And that is, that the Lord's example in this case is binding on us as a rule of conduct, because the reason on which it was founded still remains in full force. For the reason is settled to be, that it requires a preparation of heart to receive and profit by these great truths: and that it was in tenderness to those who wanted this preparation, that he held back from them what they would have rejected or abused, and what therefore could not be offered to them without fearfully enhancing their guilt. And, as it is not to be doubted

that the public preaching of these great truths now, would subject multitudes to the same fearful hazards, it is thought that it is plainly our duty to imitate the Lord's reserve, and to hold them back, except where there is due preparation to receive them aright.

Now the first remark that I would make upon this reasoning is, that it proceeds upon the infinitely precarious, I might say, infinitely improbable assumption, that we can determine all the reasons which actuated the blessed Lord in this part of His conduct. This is plainly assumed, I say, when we are asked to convert the Lord's example in this or any such case, into a rule of conduct for ourselves upon the grounds alleged,—namely, that the reason which determined His conduct obtains no less in our case. For, unless we knew all his reasons, there may plainly be some which have reference so exclusively to His office, the point of the dispensation at which He was placed, and other circumstances peculiar to Him; that while they made it right and suitable for Him, they might render it wrong and unwarrantable in us.

Nor can it be said that this is a bare and vague possibility, such as may be alleged in almost any case to suspend decision and action. Because the differences between Him and those who teach in His name now are so numerous and obvious, that it would be presumable that they, or some of them, may have entered into the motives of His conduct, or actually constituted the motives of it; even if we could not show from Scripture that they actually did. But this we can do.

1. As to His miracles,—we know from the Evangelists, that the Lord was under an apprehension that there might be a premature movement against Him on the part of His enemies on the one hand, or on the part of the people in His favour on the other. That these fears led to precautionary measures on His part on more occasions than one, both in changing the scene of His ministry and in forbidding the publication of His miracles, we are expressly told.\* And it would be very conceivable and probable, that He was influenced by the same motive on other occasions, when we are not expressly informed that such was the case.

2. As to His holding back in His public teaching the doctrine of the Atonement, it seems accounted for in some

\* To give an example out of a great many,—“It is in the retired Galilee that the Gospel seems to open with blessings, couched in the half secret, though simple forms of the Beatitudes; and it is in the crowded temple at Jerusalem, that our Lord's public ministry ends with the opposites throughout to these Beatitudes, the woes pronounced on the Jews at Jerusalem.”—Tract 80, p. 10. Now it is sufficiently obvious to remark on this case, 1. That the Lord did not choose Galilee as the seat of his ministry at this time, until he was driven to take refuge there by the danger which he had reason to apprehend in Judea. 2. That the *retired* Galilee was the part of the holy land most noted for its populousness. Indeed, the translation of Γαλιλαία παν ἑθναῖ, by *Galilee the populous*, proposed by some, however erroneous it be, was probably suggested by the fact, and certainly accords with it. Josephus, after describing it as eminently fertile, and as consequently cultivated throughout, so that not a spot was unoccupied, adds, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις πυκναὶ, καὶ παν κοίμων πληθεῖ πανταχοῦ πολυάνθρωπον διὰ τὴν εὐθηνίαν.—De Bell. Jud. 1. 3, c. 2. And, 3. Whatever were its ordinary state, the Evangelist's description of it just at the moment that the Gospel opened with the Beatitudes, shows how curiously misplaced is the epithet *retired*. “And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan.” Matt. iv. 25. And this is only a very ordinary specimen of the way in which Scripture is used throughout the Tract.



measure at least, by the consideration, that the work of the Atonement was still future. When it was distant, it seemed good to God to present it to man only in type and figure; and the same reasons, whatever they were, which led to this partial concealment of it, while it was far off, might, very intelligibly, have rendered it wrong that it should be fully disclosed, however near it came, until it was actually accomplished.

3. As to His reserve concerning His own higher nature, I might remark, (as I have done in the case of the doctrine of the Atonement,) that it is represented as more absolute than it really was. But without dwelling on this, it seems, so far as it really existed, to be accounted for by what has been already said of His reserve on the two other points, namely the doctrine of the Atonement, and the performance of his miracles. Because, as to the first, whether we can see the reason of it or not, the fact is very certain, that in the revelation which preceded the Lord's coming, the veil which was thrown over the Lord's Atonement, extended to the doctrine of the Trinity. And after the Lord's departure, when the former was clearly disclosed, the latter also was made manifest. It would not be strange to find at a time which was in its character somewhat intermediate, that while any reserve was maintained (for whatever cause) with respect to the Atonement, somewhat of the same should be exercised with respect to the Lord's Divinity. And again, as to the second, the same prudential reasons which restrained him at times from the open performance of miracles, might very intelligibly have withheld the public and explicit declaration of His nature and office, as likely no less to call forth some premature outbreak of the hostility of His enemies or the zeal of the multitude in His favour.

I am not concerned in establishing the adequacy of these reasons. It is hardly necessary, indeed, to prove their truth. It would be enough, if any reasons could be assigned for the Lord's reserve, which apply altogether to Him, and not at all to us, and which at the same time have so much probability, that no one can deny that they may have entered into the motives which determined his conduct in this matter. And these seem plainly reasons of the kind required.

And it is needless to say, that there may be others, also, which we are not able to guess at. And if there were no

more to be said, this ought to be enough to warn us against the folly and presumption of converting the Lord's procedure in this matter into a rule of conduct for ourselves, on the presumption that the full grounds of it are assigned, when it is ascribed to his reluctance to increase the condemnation of those who were not in a state to receive these high truths which he withheld.

But indeed we can go much further; and however superfluous it may be for any purpose of deciding the question, it is useful, as making it more fully understood. I remark, then, that not only does the history of the Lord's ministry furnish cases, such as these referred to, in which this reserve was exercised upon prudential reasons, and not for the moral reason which is represented as its sole motive, but it also supplies others in which the moral reason was as strong as it could have been in any, and in which, notwithstanding, no reserve was exercised.

For example, I need hardly remind you that many—indeed most of His most striking miracles, were performed in the presence of vast multitudes, and this at every stage of His ministry, from the first to the last.\*

And this of itself throws not a little doubt on the *reality* of the cause assigned in the Tract for the Lord's reserve. I do not mean of course that it raises any doubt that a sinner's guilt is fearfully aggravated by the brightness of the light against which he closes his eyes; but that it does suggest some doubt whether the Lord was influenced, as it is said, in withholding this light from His countrymen, where He did withhold it, by a gracious reluctance to add to their guilt. For it cannot be questioned that a great proportion of such vast assemblages were always unprepared rightly to receive such displays of His divine power. And that He was not restrained in so many cases from performing miracles in their presence, would seem to show that such restraint, when He did exercise it, is not to be ascribed to this moral cause, but to the prudential reasons by which we are expressly told He was influenced upon some of these occasions. A course of conduct which rested on the former motive would not seem to admit of fluctuations, while,

\* The way of dealing with this embarrassing point, which is adopted in the Tract, seems worth considering. The reader will find something upon it in Note A, at the end.

if it sprang from the latter, it would change with change of place, with the feelings of the people, and such like variable circumstances.

But indeed there is no more striking evidence how little the Lord was decided by the former motive, than that which is furnished by the very texts which are brought forward to support this theory. After other proofs, "that our Lord's manifesting himself was accompanied with very great and singular danger," it is added that "this is borne out by expressions such as these, 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin;' and, 'If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.' And we know that the places of our Lord's peculiar abode, and the scene of his mighty works, Capernaum and Bethsaida, were brought into a condition so fearful, that as to the former 'it will be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment.'"

And then it is added in the way of inference: "If, therefore, such great guilt was incurred by witnessing our Saviour's miracles and preaching, may we not reasonably suppose that the withholding the full evidence of his power, was in mercy intended to keep them back from so awful a state?"\*

Now, as I said, there can be no doubt of the fact which such passages establish, but may we not reasonably hesitate about the inference? The texts doubtless convey to us very impressively the awful aggravation of guilt which the abuse of distinguished blessings brings. But do they not also convey to us, that the fullest apprehension of this result did not influence the Lord to withhold these blessings? For He *did* come and speak those gracious words to His countrymen, and do those wonderful works among them, which were to be their condemnation. And Chorazin, and Bethsaida, and Capernaum, upon which this heavy sentence was pronounced, *were* 'the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done.' And, as if for the very purpose of restraining the rash conclusion, that it was the state of preparation of those to whom He preached, which determined His giving or withholding such manifestations of His nature and office, He adds, to the further condemnation of the cities which had been favoured in vain, that had the same works been done in Sodom of

old, it would have been saved from destruction, and that even at that very day, if the same wonders had been wrought in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago."\*

Now, are not all those passages to which I have been referring sufficient to prove that this theory of the motives of the Lord's reserve, is not only without any scripture foundation, but that it is maintained in opposition to very strong scripture evidence? And, in fact, if we were to assert that the Lord never withheld any manifestation of his divine power from men, under an apprehension, that they were not prepared to use it, but to their own hurt, should we not seem to be speaking with far more scripture warrant than they who ascribe to this motive all the reserve which he exercised? But I have no intention of making any such positive assertion. What we ought to feel, I am sure, is, that we are going beyond our line when we venture to assign absolutely the grounds of such a procedure. I believe that it would be very rash to maintain that this consideration did not enter into the reasons of the Lord's reserve. But we can be very sure that it did not influence his conduct in any way which would make it safe or warrantable in us to follow His example. For he certainly did not act upon it in the cases in which it must have been strongest; and, therefore, if it influenced him at all, it must have been in conjunction with other reasons, and controlled by them. And what we see most certainly is, that when *they* made it right to manifest his divine power, the clearest knowledge that the manifestation would be abused by those to whom it was made, was not a sufficient reason for withhold-

\* A very awful passage, in which the Lord gives the reason of his speaking in parables to the multitude, appears with some variation in the three first Evangelists—(Matt. xiii. 11–15; Mark iv. 11, 12; Luke viii. 10.) But it seems in all, and especially in St. Mark, to present this part of His *reserve* (His speaking to the multitude in parables,) in the light of a judicial act, and as much as possible removed from a gracious withholding from them of knowledge which would be injurious to them. But as this opens matter which could not be satisfactorily or very safely treated, except at some length, I have omitted all notice of it in the text, and only give it a place here to show how much there was to deter one, who approached such subjects with any genuine reverence, or indeed decent caution, from the rashness of which the author of the Tract has been guilty.



ing it. Can it be pretended, then, that we are following His example, if we exercise reserve in preaching Him, His nature, and His work, whenever we think we see grounds for apprehending that those to whom we speak may not be so prepared to receive such teaching, and rightly to use it? Would not this mode of deriving a rule of conduct from His example (setting aside for a moment the question, whether we have not in the case a certain and opposite rule in his commands,) be a very presumptuous and dishonest mode of dealing with the matter? So far as the other motives of His conduct in such cases (which we have seen were the controlling and regulating motives,) are unknown to us, we should be plainly acting in the dark in imitating His reserve. So far as we seem to have reason from scripture to suppose that His motives were personal and temporary, we should be acting against reason and scripture in imitating Him.

But still further. We have already seen how far we have reason to suppose that His reserve is to be ascribed to other motives rather than the one assigned. But, however the question as to his motives might be settled, we have manifold intimations that, in point of fact, the reserve which He exercised was to have an end: that the purposes for which it was adopted only required it to be maintained while His work in the flesh was going on, and that, that once over, what He for the time concealed should be made manifest to all. Passages which convey this to us, must be familiar to every one, and it is not merely that such intimations are lost upon the writer of the Tract, but his mode of dealing with them shows him to have consulted Scripture under prepossessions which prevented him from seeing anything there, except what made for his theory. For, when he comes to a passage which contains such an intimation, he actually takes the evidence that it gives, that reserve was exercised by the Lord, and leaves behind, the proof which it gives, that this reserve was to cease with His departure!

For example. The caution which He gives to the disciples who witnessed the transfiguration, not to speak of what they had seen, is referred to as among the proofs that he was careful not to divulge his divinity, or any thing which would indicate Divine power.\* And no notice

is taken of the fact that, while He gives the command, He expressly limits its obligation to the accomplishment of His work in the flesh; "He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, *till the Son of Man were risen from the dead.*"\* Does not this very clearly point to a difference between the Lord's circumstances and theirs, which would make it needless or wrong for them to maintain the silence or reserve upon this point, which He, from whatever cause, saw necessary while He was with them?

But does not he convey very clearly, that this applied to all that he taught them in secret, and hid from the rest of His countrymen, when He tells them "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light, and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye in the house tops?"

Now can more be needed to show the strange perverseness of seeking to draw a rule for the guidance of ministers at the present day from reserve, exercised by

\* In the same way, among the proofs that the Lord 'was in the habit of concealing in a remarkable manner, His divine power and majesty, excepting so far as persons might be found capable of receiving it,' we find the Jews' complaining expostulation—"How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly"—brought forward (No. 80, p. 21.) without any notice whatever of His reply: "I told you before, and ye believed not." Perhaps it will be said that He adds, "The works which I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me;" and that probably the former part of what He says does not mean, that He had told them *in words* who He was, but that they ought to have learned it from his works. Perhaps so. But still, even if this be His meaning, it is no less opposed to the view of His reserve, which is given in the Tract, in which, as we have seen, it is not merely maintained that He abstained from any express declaration of His divine nature, from those who were unprepared rightly to use the knowledge, but from any such displays of His divine power as were fitted to reveal it. Now that they to whom He was speaking on this occasion were unprepared for such a revelation, we may assume, for otherwise the case would have no conceivable application to the point for which it is brought forward. But indeed how very unprepared they were,—in what a state, not of blindness only, but of hardness and bitterness—appears sufficiently by what follows, where it appears that when He does declare expressly, "I and my Father are one," they took up stones again to stone him. Even in this view of the meaning of the Lord's answer, therefore, it in all fairness required to be noticed when the Jews' complaint was resorted to, to prove His reserve.

\* Tract, No. 80, p. 15.



the blessed Lord in His earthly ministry? Suppose that the assumption of our knowledge of the motives of His conduct, through which it is converted into a rule for us, were not, as it is, infinitely precarious and improbable, but in the highest degree probable; suppose that the motive assigned were supported by the Scriptures, instead of being, as I have shown, discountenanced and overthrown by them; still with such distinct intimations, that in what He did in this way, He was not to be imitated by those who were to preach after Him, would it not be plainly our duty to seek guidance in preaching the gospel rather from His commands to those preachers who were to follow Him, than from His own example? And when we find him commanding that they should "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" "that repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in his name among all nations;" and when we find that with whatever reserve He might have declared the doctrine of the Trinity during His own ministry, they were by His appointment to require a profession of belief in this great mystery, at the very threshold of the Church, from all whom they permitted to enter it: when we see this, I say, we could hardly doubt, that according to His very distinct intimations, the reserve which He had found it right, for whatever cause, to maintain, was now at an end.

And if, in the way in which every thing may be made doubtful, questions are raised about the true meaning of these commands, is it not manifestly our wisdom and our duty to look at the example of the first preachers of the truth, to see how they understood His commands, and how far they felt bound by the example of His reserve?

I need not review their preaching, to show how little countenance it affords to the principle of holding back from sinners the Atonement of the blessed Lord. I feel, that for you, such proofs cannot be necessary. I cannot however refrain from reminding you of a single passage, which shows how deeply impressed St. Paul was with the awful truth, that they who hear the everlasting gospel, and reject it, are in far deeper condemnation than if it had never sounded in their ears; and at the same time, how little he was restrained from preaching it, by the thought, even while it seems to overwhelm him with awe—"Now thanks be

unto God," he says, "who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge [the knowledge of him] by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are a savour of life unto life; and to the other, a savour of death unto death. And who is sufficient for these things?"

Here we see the holy Apostle rejoicing, and returning thanks to God, for enabling him to preach the gospel of Christ, and to make Him known "in every place." And although he knew so well that one result of his preaching was so tremendously to enhance the guilt of those who refused to hear, this did not withhold him from delivering his message; nay, nor from thanking God that He had enabled him to deliver it. For this is the simple subject of his fervent thanksgiving. And if there were no other passage in the New Testament bearing on the question, ought not this to decide it? Ought not this, were it alone, to show that we are grievously mistaking our place and duty as preachers of the gospel, when we think ourselves warranted in holding it back in any case, from the apprehension that it will be rejected, and so will aggravate the guilt of those to whom it is offered?

I do not mean, as I said, to bring forward the proofs which St. Paul's Epistles supply, to show the place which the Atonement held in his preaching, but the mode in which all this scriptural evidence is disposed of is too instructive an exhibition of the way in which Scripture is dealt with in this cause, to be omitted. After having positively asserted that "*All Scripture is a harmony as opposed to this modern system*, (i. e. the explicit preaching of the Atonement, to which the Tract is opposed,) the writer goes on ingenuously to confess that the Epistles of St. Paul may seem to favour it, but then he asserts that this is only at first sight. The proof of this assertion is as follows: 'The singular characteristic of St. Paul, as shown in all his Epistles and speeches, seems to have been a going out of himself to enter into the feelings, and put himself into the circumstances of others. This will account for the occasions on which he brings forward this doctrine; as in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. In both of these cases, the prejudices which closed up their ears

against the reception of the truth, were such as were essentially opposed to the atonement. So much in the writings of St. Paul, does the Holy Spirit adapt his teaching to the wants of each, as our Lord did in His incarnation, a principle which is opposed to this opinion."\*

And this is literally all that it is thought necessary to say, to get rid of all the evidence which St. Paul's Epistles afford of the way in which he brought forward the doctrine which we are recommended to hold back! But I believe that most persons will be of opinion that this is rather too succinct a mode of dealing with this body of evidence against reserve in this matter. If the question were about the mode of bringing forward the doctrine of the Atonement in our preaching, and if it were maintained by any that it was to be preached upon every occasion, and to all in the same way—that it was to be explained at length, proved in form, defended, and guarded alike, on every occasion, and to every congregation, without any reference to their state of knowledge, belief, or other circumstances; and if the preacher justified such a course by a reference to St. Paul's, in his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, it might be pertinently replied, that if St. Paul does present the doctrine in this way in these Epistles, they at the same time supply grounds for believing that it was specially misinterpreted and misunderstood, and opposed and abused among those to whom he was writing. And that if these Epistles show that under such circumstances we may and ought to take the like pains to establish its true nature, and its legitimate consequences,—to prove it by argument, to defend it from objections, and to guard it from abuse,—the other Epistles of the same Apostle show that, under different circumstances, a less didactic and controversial mode of bringing it forward may be adopted, not only with the sanction of reason, but of his example. To such a question as I have supposed, this would be a fair and sufficient answer. But this is not the question. The question is, whether we are in our preaching to present this Doctrine to sinners, as the truth by the cordial reception of which they are to be reconciled to God; and whether, with those who are so reconciled, we are to employ it as the truth through which the Spirit gives them power to walk as becomes God's chil-

dren. And when such is the question, to what purpose is this answer made? No doubt St. Paul very far excelled all who attempt to imitate him at the present day, as in the other gifts and graces of the preacher of the gospel, so in this also, of wisely accommodating what he spoke to the condition of his hearers. And few will doubt that when the doctrine was better understood, or less opposed in a particular church, it was his duty rather to press its consequences upon them, than to prove it or defend it. But then, its fundamental nature, the necessity of belief in it, its real place in the Christian scheme, and in the preaching of a Christian minister, may appear clearly in such a mode of using it, no less than in the other. And at all events, if we have collected from any of his fuller and more formal statements that this doctrine has an essential and fundamental place in a Christian's belief, the most incidental way of speaking of it, in Epistles to those who had received it, may so fall in with this conception of its nature and importance, as to give to it just the kind of confirmation which we ought to look for. For it ought to be remembered, that just in the degree in which we have reason to regard the Atonement as a fundamental and essential truth, should we have reason to expect to find the belief of it, in general, in an Apostle's letter to a Christian Church, rather assumed than inculcated. And in point of fact, the doctrine does meet us in St. Paul's Epistles generally in the way in which we ought to expect to find it there; not in formal statements of it, as if it were before unknown, but in references to it more or less explicit, which are sufficient to show that it was a truth taught to, and professed by, all to whom he wrote; and to him, and to them, the foundation of all their hopes, and the source of all the motives by which they were sustained and animated in their Christian course.

We have in this way in the other Epistles the fullest confirmation of what we collect from the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, of the place which a belief in Christ's Atonement holds in the faith of a Christian man, and of the place which the Atonement must therefore hold in the teaching of a Christian preacher. But indeed upon that point, these more regularly doctrinal Epistles are so clear and express, as to make us independent of any confirmation. It is hardly possible as you well know, to conceive any

\* Tract, No. 80, p. 74.



form of setting forth the necessity and efficacy of faith, as the instrument of our justification, and of our sanctification too, which is not to be found in those epistles. And it would be plainly impossible that any honest steward of the mysteries of God, who believed that faith has such an office to perform for sinners, as Paul declares it to have—the same office for all sinners—could hold back the publication of the object of faith from any committed to his care.

On this subject, however, some of St. Paul's Epistles, being addressed to Churches which he had founded, and containing references to his first preaching, furnish still more direct proofs. And it is acknowledged in the Tract, that the use of the doctrine which it opposes, might seem to receive some countenance from the way in which St. Paul speaks of himself in such passages, as at all times preaching "CHRIST crucified." But, as before, it is maintained, that this is only a first impression, which a little consideration will more than remove. And the proof of this assertion is as follows:—

"It will be evident, on a little attention, that when St. Paul thus speaks, it is not the Atonement and Divinity of the blessed Lord which he brings forward, although *it is implied in that saying*. The whole of St. Paul's life and actions after his conversion, and the whole of his teaching, as appears in the Epistles, may be said to have been nothing else but a setting forth of Christ crucified, as the one great principle which absorbed all his heart, and actuated all his conduct. It was the wood cast into the waters, which entirely changed them into its own nature, and impregnated them with itself. This is intimated by expressions of this kind, which are of continual occurrence, such as "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ;" "I was determined not to know anything among you but Christ crucified." "But we preach Christ crucified." Now these words of course imply "the atonement," as a life-giving principle contained in them; but it is a great mistake to suppose that they contain nothing more, or that by preaching the atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by Christ crucified. It may be seen by an attention to the context in all the passages where these expressions occur, that it is a very different view, and in fact the opposite to the modern notion, which St. Paul always

intends by it. It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world; it is our humiliation together with him,—mortification of the flesh,—being made conformable to his sufferings and to his death. . . . If the doctrine of the atonement is conveyed in the expression of Christ crucified, as used by St. Paul, it is by teaching at the same time the necessity of our mortification, which is repugnant to opinions now received. . . .

"The cross of Christ which St. Paul preached, was that by which "the world was crucified to him, and he was crucified to the world," "bearing about him the body of the dying of the Lord Jesus." And precisely the same was the teaching of our blessed Lord also. His own humiliation, and the necessity of our humiliation together with Him, was the doctrine signified by the cross which He put forth, and inculcated on the multitude in distinction from that of His own divinity, and our salvation through the same, which He rather kept secret."\*

How this strange passage confuses and misrepresents the true question on this point, between the writer of the Tract, and those whom he opposes, I have little doubt might be safely left to you to detect for yourselves. But it is a matter of so much importance, that I think no opportunity ought to be lost of putting it beyond the possibility of mistake. You must therefore bear with a few words upon it, however superfluous you may feel them to be for yourselves.

That St. Paul does insist upon the necessity of our being "crucified with Christ," "crucified to the world," "mortified to the flesh," made conformable to His sufferings and His death, is very certain. And that preachers at the present day ought to do likewise, is very certain too. And about this no question has been raised, or hinted at, so far as I know, by any of the opponents of the Tract. The true question is: Whether Paul sought to effect this needful transformation in those to whom he preached, by reserving the doctrine of the Atonement, or by publishing it? Whether he exercised this economy, which is now pressed upon the preachers of the Gospel as their duty; and kept back this great truth from sinners, until he had brought them by moral training to a meanness to receive this high mystery? or whether, on the contrary, he did not make it the foundation on which

\* Tract, No. 80, pp. 74, 75.

he built all Christian morals, the source from which he drew all motives to Christian obedience, and *that* by making it first the foundation and the source of all Christian hopes? This is the true question. And I trust, my reverend brethren, that you feel that this ought not to be a question. I trust that you feel that it is only to very great ignorance of the Scriptures, or to such violent prepossession as renders all knowledge of them fruitless, that it can be a question. Remembering to whom I am speaking, I have felt that I might and ought to abstain from adducing detailed Scripture proofs of the statements which I have been making, trusting that I was stating to you familiar and well-established truths, with the proper proofs of which you were too well acquainted to require any adduction of them. I am not going to deviate from this plan now, but I cannot refrain from quoting a single passage,—one which, were there no other, ought to be enough to decide this question. In describing the motives under which he was enabled to dedicate himself to the service of his Lord (and the same ought to be the motives of all Christ's followers) St. Paul says: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but to him that died for them, and rose again." Here then is the principle which was to sustain and animate the follower of Christ in treading the path of patience, humility, self-denial, and suffering, which his Master trod: he was serving a Master who *had died for him*, and who died, that they who through His death received life, might *live* to Him. And, in the course of the same passage, the Apostle describes himself, after having been reconciled by God unto Himself by Jesus Christ, as having been intrusted with the ministry of reconciliation; and then proceeds both to describe and to execute his office with certainly but slender traces of reserve. Declaring, "That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," and, as God's ambassador, and in Christ's stead, earnestly intreating those to whom he wrote to be reconciled unto God, he states finally, with emphatic energy, the vicarious character of the blessed Lord in the flesh, as at once the proper foundation of the work, and the proper enforcement of the word of reconciliation; "For God

made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

And I need not tell you that there is no duty which Christians are commanded to perform, and no sacrifice which they are called on to make, which is not in the same way connected with what Christ has done and suffered for sinners, throughout the Epistles of St. Paul. Nor in this use of the Atonement is he distinguished from his fellow Apostles, though they were not led so largely to explain or so often to enforce this great doctrine. St. Peter, for example, in the same way, reminds those whom he was exhorting, to endure and to act as became Christians, to be holy, to pass the time of their sojourning here in fear,—of the motives under which they were thus to obey and to suffer: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as with silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." And exhorting them to all long-suffering, patience, and resignation, by Christ's example in suffering: he gives His great atoning work, by which His course of suffering was crowned, as the source from which this work in them was to be drawn: "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps. . . . Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed."

Thus it is, as you well know, my reverend brethren, that the first preachers of the Gospel make the preaching—the explicit and unreserved preaching—of the Cross, on which Christ's atoning work was finished, the foundation of their preaching of the Cross, which, after His example, and for his sake, we are to bear. Thus it is that they make Christian morals rest ever upon Christian faith.

The Tracts to which we have referred, however, stigmatize this course as 'unscriptural, and uncatholic, and unreal.' And, as you have heard, propose in its stead the directly opposite course, in which Christian faith is not the foundation, but the fruit, of a life of Christian obedience. I shall give you a distinct view of this course from the statements



of its advocate. It will take some time, but it is worth all the time that it will require.

It is said, 'That the preparations of the heart which can alone receive the faith in its fulness, are by other means than those which this system supposes, we cannot but be assured; Scripture and reason both would imply, that it is, by insisting first of all upon natural piety, on the necessity of common honesty, on repentance, on judgment to come, and without any mode of expression that excepts ourselves from that judgment, by urging those assistances to poverty of spirit which Scripture recommends, and the Church prescribes, such as fasting, and alms, and the necessity of reverent and habitual prayer. These *may* be means of bringing persons to the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus, with that awe and fear, which our Lord's own teaching and that of His Apostles would inspire.\*

What seems to be intended here is, that, as this doctrine can only be apprehended in its fulness by those who have certain preparations of the heart, it is in vain presented to men until these preparations are effected—that it is by first implanting sound and pious principles, and leading men to a pure and holy life, that they are to be brought to receive this great truth. And this is more fully set forth afterwards: 'Religious Doctrines, and Articles of Faith, can only be received according to certain dispositions of the heart; these dispositions can only be formed by a repetition of certain actions. And, therefore, a certain course of action can alone dispose us to receive certain doctrines; and hence, it is evident that these doctrines are in vain preached, unless these actions are at the same time practised and insisted on as most essential.

'For instance, charitable works alone will make a man charitable, and the more any one does charitable works, the more charitable will he become; that is to say, the more will he love his neighbour and love God; for a charitable work is a work that proceeds from charity or the love of God, and which can only be done by the good Spirit of God: and the more he does these works, therefore, the more will he love his neighbour and love God. . . . He, therefore, will most love God and love Christ, who does these

works most; and he will most bring men to Christ who most effectually, with God's blessing, induces them to do these works in the way that God hath required them to be done.

'Or again, he only will be humble in heart who does humble actions, and no action is (morally speaking) humble, but such as proceeds from the spirit of humility; and he who does humble actions most, will be most humble; and he who is most humble, will be most emptied of self, and, therefore, will most value the cross of Christ. . . . That teacher, therefore, who will most induce men to do these works, will most of all bring men unto Christ, though he speak not most fully and loudly of His ever-blessed Atonement.

'Or again, good works consist especially in prayers. He who does most of these good works—*i. e.* who prays most, seeks most of all for an assistance out of, and beyond himself, and, therefore, relies least of all on himself, and most of all upon God; and the more he does of these good works, the more does he rely upon God's good SPIRIT, for which he seeks. He, therefore, who, by preaching the judgment to come, or by recommending alms and fasting, or by impressing men with a sense of the shortness of life and the value of eternity, or by any such practical appeals which the occasion suggests, will lead men most to pray, will do most towards leading them to lean on God's good SPIRIT, although he may not repeat in express words the necessity of aid from that good SPIRIT, without whom we cannot please God.\*

Here is the system which you are called on to embrace, and these are the grounds on which it relies. And I suppose it can hardly be necessary that I should point out to you how it misplaces and abuses the two most certain, and most important truths, on which it professedly rests. One of these is: that it is by action that principles are wrought into our moral nature, so as to become a part of it. And the other is: that the more that we grow in heavenly-mindedness and in all holy affections, the more thoroughly shall we apprehend, and the more intimately shall we embrace, the great truth of the Atonement of the blessed Lord, and all the high truths which are involved in it, or connected with it. The writer has no contest here with those

\* Tract, No. 87. p. 51.

\* Tract, No. pp. 58, 59.

whom he is opposing. The question is, how are these principles to be implanted? And can there be any reasonable doubt, that if, with the everlasting Gospel in our hands, we were to turn to the motives which natural religion supplies, to implant in men humility, the love of God, and the love of man, and the various principles which enter into and constitute a spirit of prayer, can there be any doubt, (to say nothing of the desperate presumption of the procedure,) that we should be acting with the most senseless perverseness?—that we should be casting away the most powerful motives which can be brought to bear upon man's heart, in order to do their work by others, which, however real they be, are of proved inefficacy? For what have the motives which natural religion supplies ever done to implant such principles in the heart,—to give men humility, the love of God, or a spirit of prayer,—that they should be now resorted to, while we neglect or set aside those great and glorious truths which have such manifest fitness to make us humble, to shed abroad the love of God in our hearts, and to dispose us and to enable us to pray to Him?

But let us see how God's word settles this question. It is desired to engage us in a course of charitable actions, for example, in order that we may be more entirely possessed and ruled by the love of God. And it is acknowledged that outward actions will only have this tendency, if they spring from the principle which they are designed to perfect. The love of God must therefore be in our hearts: and how is it to be implanted there; Let the beloved disciple answer; "We love him, because he first loved us." Well! it may be said, but does natural religion give no proofs of His love? Doubtless it does; and though in looking for them, we are perplexed with contradictory appearances, and discouraged by the voice of conscience in the application of them, still doubtless we may collect some predominant indications of the love of God even amidst the ruins of this fallen world. But is it to these that St. John sends us for proofs of the love of God? Nay. "HEREBY perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." "IN THIS was manifested," (as though every other manifestation of it were too dim or too uncertain to be visible to one who had before his eyes the brightness of the display of divine love in the Atonement,) "IN THIS was manifested the love of God, because

that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." "HEREIN is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." And as God's love to us, thus manifested, is to be the source of our love to him, so is it to be of our love to each other. "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." And indeed the Lord Himself in the same way directs our minds to it as the source of that love, which is the proper source of obedience to him: "If ye love me ye will keep my commandments." "And this is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." And then follows the proof of His love which is to be the spring of theirs: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

But if I were to go on giving the texts, which offer themselves, to show that God's love to us in the gift of Christ to die for us, is to be the source of our trust in Him, of our love of Him, and so of our obedience to Him; and of our love to our neighbour too, (which again is the true principle of the fulfilment of the part of the Law which regards *him*.) I should be carried much too far. And even if I had undertaken the task of proving this to you, (which I have already more than once disclaimed,) I might rely upon the few passages which I have brought forward, as a full and sufficient proof of it; and so as a proof that if you will implant these principles *scripturally*, you must do it through such explicit preaching of the Atonement of the blessed Lord, as is needed to secure a cordial belief of that glorious truth in your hearers.

An attempt however is made to show that even for this purpose—for the purpose of producing Faith in Christ and securing all its consequences,—it is needless to break the reserve recommended with regard to this doctrine. Because implicit faith is enough; and *it* does not require explicit knowledge, or, of course, explicit preaching. 'For if, in the case of Abraham, and many others, of the most approved faith in CHRIST, there was no such explicit knowledge, it may be the case now. If a poor woman, ignorant and superstitious, as might be supposed, was received of our Lord with so instant a blessing, for touching the border of His clothes, may it not have been the case, that in times, which are now considered dark and lost to Gospel truth, there might



have been many a helpless person, who knelt to a crucifix in a village churchyard, who might have done so under a more true sense of that faith which is unto life, than those who are able to express the most enlightened knowledge. And this case and these suppositions are given as the foundation of the proposition quoted before: viz. 'And not only is the exclusive and naked exposure of so very sacred a truth, unscriptural and dangerous, but, as Bishop Wilson says, the comforts of religion ought to be applied with great caution. And moreover to require from both grown persons and children, an explicit declaration of a belief in the Atonement, and the full assurance of its power, appears equally untenable.'\*

Now if one were perplexed and distressed by the contemplation of the multitudes, who by no fault of their own, as it seems, but by God's providential arrangements, are shut out from the knowledge of the Gospel, or confined to dark, or partial, or erroneous views of it; or if one were forming harsh judgments upon the state of all such persons; the case of God's saints of old, whose apprehension of the great truths of the Gospel must have been comparatively obscure and uncertain, might be fitly resorted to, to suggest grounds for the hope that, in the depths of His mercy, there may exist some mode of connecting persons, under the circumstances above referred to, with Christ's atoning work,—something different from that faith in Him which seems so clearly revealed as the appointed mode to us. For this, or any such purpose, such instances might be legitimately brought forward. But it is a very different thing when they are resorted to, to assist in persuading a preacher that he may safely withhold from those committed to his care, that knowledge of Christ's Atonement which it is in his power to impart, and which he seems appointed to impart, under so heavy a responsibility. If I feared that you were in any danger of being led into any such abuse of cases of this kind, I ought to remind you, that whatever hopes they may suggest for those who do not believe in Christ, because His atoning work has not been set before them, they offer none for the teacher, through whose reserve they have been kept in ignorance. But I trust you need no such warning, to preserve you

from the woe which the Lord denounces against those who *take away the key of knowledge*. I trust that you feel that that woe is upon you, *if you preach not the Gospel*, and that you know and feel that you cannot preach the Gospel, unless you preach CHRIST, and Him crucified. I trust that you do preach the Cross of Christ, so that its humbling and purifying, its sustaining and animating power, may be made known to those to whom you preach. But I trust also that you feel that there is but one way of doing this,—by preaching the reconciling work which Christ wrought upon the Cross; and that not reservedly or impliedly; that you are not to hold back Christ's atoning work upon the Cross, or to preach it only by implication, or only as a mystery to the fully initiated, but that you are to preach it distinctly, fully, and openly to ALL.

Indeed one hardly knows what is the meaning of recommending to preachers to hold back this truth, under an apprehension of the consequences of making it known. Blessed be God! they cannot do it, if they would. The Bible, in which it is distinctly, openly, and unreservedly, set forth, is the patrimony of our people; and, blessed be God! they are in possession of it. And if we needed direction as to the will of God in this matter, would it not seem to a reverent mind, an indication of His will not lightly to be disregarded, that the Holy Scriptures, in which this great truth is to be found so unreservedly stated, nay, in which it is not to be missed, by any one who reads them with a simple desire to know what they contain,—that these Scriptures, written by His Spirit for our learning, are now, by His providential arrangements, in the hands of all?

Yes, this may make some such impression upon one who thinks that this wide diffusion of the word of God is right, and according to His will. But from the same quarter from which these views of the necessity of exercising reserve in the declaration of the doctrine of the Atonement, come, there are no obscure intimations of dissatisfaction at the indiscriminate distribution of the Bible. The writer of these two tracts in particular, is not to be charged with overlooking the fact, or with treating it inconsistently. For he very distinctly extends his disapprobation of the free publication of the doctrine from the pulpit, to the unrestricted distribution of the

\* Tract, No. 80, p. 78.



book in which it is contained. This is the passage to which I refer :

‘ Much of what has been said, may be applied to an indiscriminate distribution of Bibles and religious publications. We must not expect that the work which occasioned our Saviour and His disciples so much pains, can be done by such means. We have rather to look with awe on these new dealings of Providence with mankind. It might, perhaps, be thought that, if it is a state of the heart alone which can receive the truth, to bring it forward before persons unprepared to acknowledge it does not signify. Such persons cannot receive it ; and therefore the effect is merely nugatory and unavailing. But this does not follow : that they cannot receive it is the appointment of God, but our attempting to act contrary to his mode of acting may be productive of evil.’\*

Still one would say, that were we to withhold the Bible, from the hands of the people, the end would not be attained. For our Church, besides all else that she has done, to break this law of reserve, has not only urged all her members diligently to read the word of God, but she has taken care that if they attend on her ministrations they shall hear it. She has so ordered her public services, that while, in the daily lessons which form a part both of the morning and of the evening service, the most part of the Old Testament is read every year, the whole New Testament shall be read over orderly every year *thrice*, besides the Epistles and Gospels. And she has enjoined that these lessons shall be read ‘ distinctly and with an audible voice,’ ‘ he that readeth so standing and turning himself, as he may be best heard of all such as are present.’ So that our reserving the doctrine, and reserving the book, will be unavailing, as long as our churches are provided for all, and are open to all. And accordingly, it is very clear, that in this matter, too, there is something to blame, and something to amend, though what or how does not so distinctly appear. The true views of reserve are put forward as a suitable test of the popular modes of extending Christianity, one of which is described to be ‘ that of bringing churches near to every body.’ As to the building of churches, it is acknowledged that it is clear from Scripture, that it is a work acceptable to God, and therefore neces-

sarily productive of good, as requiring sacrifices on the part of the individuals, by whom they are erected, and therefore greatly beneficial to them ; and also as setting up a witness. But as to this end of providing a place of public worship for those who are without one, and a place where they may be instructed, exhorted, rebuked, and warned from the pulpit, the case is very different. “ But when the Utilitarian view is taken of the subject, are we not thinking that we may do by human means, and such as partake of this world, that which is the work of God alone ; as if the mammon of the world could promote the cause of God. For if the erection of churches, which from commodiousness and easiness of access are to invite, and from their little cost partake more of a low contriving expediency, than of a generous love of God,—is to do the work of religion, then is it more easy to win souls than Scripture will warrant us in supposing. On the contrary, if the maxim be true, that ‘ men venerate that which resisteth them, and that which courteth their favour, they despise,’ then have we to fear, lest, rather than doing good, we be breaking that holy law which hath commanded that we give not that which is holy to the dogs ; the Church’s best gifts be trod under foot, and her enemies turn and rend her. For if churches are to be brought home to all, then are all persons to be brought into churches, and that by human means.”\* So that those who have been doing what in them lay, to mitigate, if they might not wholly take away the opprobrium, and the disease, and the sin of England,—her churchless multitudes in the midst of her wealth,—if the sacred edifices which they have erected be not duly commodious, or inaccessible, or costly, it is to be feared, lest, rather than doing good, *they have been breaking that holy law which hath commanded that we give not that which is holy to the dogs !*

I do not think that this needs, or that it would bear, any comment.

Such are some of the fruits of a dread of the effects of the Gospel, when preached in the freeness and fulness in which it appears in Holy Scripture. I need not add anything upon these two tracts, but the object for which I have so long dwelt upon them, requires that I should notice, however briefly, another of the series, in

\* Tract No. 80, pp. 70, 71.

\* Tract No. 80, pp. 68, 69.

which we find the same apprehensions giving rise to what seems a still bolder effort in the same cause. In those which we have been considering, preachers only seem persuaded to hold back the word of reconciliation committed to them, but in that to which I am about to direct your attention now, they are told that they have no such message to deliver to sinners, i. e. to the sinners to whom they have to address themselves in Christian countries. *They* have sinned after having enjoyed all the privileges and blessings of baptism; and it is maintained that for such sinners there is no such plenary remission again in this life as they have already received in that rite.\* That 'We have no account in scripture of any second remission, obliteration, extinction of all sin, such as is bestowed on us by "the one baptism for the remission of sins."† 'The fountain has been indeed opened to wash away sin and uncleanness, but we dare not promise them a second time the same easy access to it which they once had: that way is open but once: it were to abuse the power of the keys entrusted to us, again to pretend to admit them thus: now there remains only the 'baptism of tears,' a baptism obtained, as the same fathers said, with much fasting, and with many prayers.‡ Not that you are to understand that even by that process the sinner can attain to *that peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*, which the Apostle describes as the portion of those who *are justified by faith*. No, as the author of the Tract sets forth in another work,§ 'there are but two periods of absolute cleansing: baptism and the day of judgment.' In the former we are 'washed once for all in Christ's blood, but if we again sin, there remaineth no more such complete ablution in this life. We must bear the scars of the sins which we have contracted. We must be judged according to our deeds.'||

\* Tract 68, one of three Tracts on Holy Baptism, published (I believe) in 1835.

† Tract, No. 68, p. 54. ‡ Ibid. p. 59.

§ Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford.

|| Tract, No. 68, p. 63. St. Paul declares that "We must ALL stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." And there are very many passages which testify no less distinctly that this judgment, a judgment according to their deeds, awaits ALL. How other passages, without lowering the demands of the divine law, ena-

There are in Scripture gracious invitations addressed by Christ to all who are weary and heavy laden, and gracious offers of rest to them; and large and precious promises to all who truly turn unto Him; and invitations and promises, no less full and free, which His apostles afterwards delivered in His name. But when we have to address those who 'after baptism have turned away from God;' we are gravely recommended to consider 'whether we have any right at once to appropriate to them the gracious words with which our Saviour invited those who had never known Him, and with which through His church, He still invites His true disciples to the participation of His most precious Body and Blood—"Come unto me, ye that labour and are heavy laden."\* Whether having

ble us to look forward to such a judgment, with any thing short of despair, it is unnecessary here to inquire. But with these passages in the Bible, and indeed in the memory of most readers of the Bible, it does seem very strange to find this condition stated as the fruit of a certain amount of post-baptismal sin. There is no difficulty in conceiving the theory which leads to the statement; but I find it hard to conjecture what warrant in Scripture it is supposed to have.

\* It seems a curious example of unsteadiness and confusion, that the invitation, which is treated here as addressed by the Church in Christ's name to His true disciples, and as not to be addressed to those who after Baptism have turned away from God, is regarded in the same author's letter to the Bishop of Oxford, as addressed by her to this latter class of sinners, and her use of it is given as among the proofs that she does not pretend to absolve them absolutely, and has no commission to tell them that their sins are blotted out, but remits them to Christ, that they may find rest for their souls. (p. 93.) Still later the writer, (in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury last year) while he says, 'What I wrote, I hope that with deepening years I hold more deeply; acknowledges that his 'statement was imperfect as making no mention of the healing and comforting power of Absolution, or the pardoning grace of the Holy Eucharist.' p. 92. And in a note he refers with much approbation to a work, which seems to differ from his own chiefly in the extent to which it insists upon a course of ecclesiastical discipline, ending in ministerial Absolution, as the divinely appointed way for the recovery of fallen Christians. He speaks of it as "a very solemn sermon on the same subject recently published; 'Evangelical Repentance,' with an Appendix by the Rev. C. Wordsworth, in which he considers all the texts which speak of repentance, and refers to modern writers also," and adds, "Its tone makes it one of the cheering signs of the times." Mr. Wordsworth's view seems to be, that though, "doubt-



no fresh 'Baptism for the remission of sin' to offer, no means of 'renewing them to repentance,' we have any right to apply to them the words which the Apostles used in inviting men for the first time into the ark of Christ.\* What

less, it is possible to find passages in the New Testament which extend the application of the word in question [repentance] so as to cover the commission even of deadly sin. . .

. . . yet that whether or no Repentance, *when so extended*, may not imply in *every case* the further notion of ecclesiastical penance. . .

. . . This, as it is a point of most serious and awful concern, so it is not perhaps very easy to determine; [i. e. as he is careful to inform us in a note, *out of Scripture itself*; because as to the practical determination of it by the primitive Church, there is by no means the same room for doubt.] pp. 12, 13. And he asks, "Are we justified in teaching that which is so far doubtfully and scantily written—I speak advisedly, *which is scantily written*—as if it were emblazoned in the brightest and boldest characters, and to be read in every page?" p. 14. And he concludes both from the testimony of Scripture and the practice of the primitive Church, 'that the safe and divinely appointed way for the recovery of fallen Christians would seem to be by ecclesiastical discipline ending in ministerial absolution.' And this extends to all grievous sin, secret as well as open. For Mr. Palmer's statement, which seems to confine such public penance to 'the case of sins which were public, and caused scandal,' does not satisfy him. Mr. Palmer asserts, that 'it was generally taught that confession of secret sins to God, with a truly contrite heart, and changed life, was sufficient to obtain remission of sins.' But Mr. Wordsworth gives a note on this passage, (which he quotes.) 'The reader who pays attention to the following extracts, will see much reason to question this assertion. Indeed it is, I think, very *questionable*.' (App. p. 3.) And he infers "that the absence of any such discipline in effect and practice among ourselves ought to make us cautious in preaching the momentous doctrines, and in describing the true measures of sin and repentance." But this seems too soft an enunciation of the conclusion to which the premises lead. For if 'Ecclesiastical discipline ending in ministerial absolution,' be the *divinely appointed mode*, not merely of reconciling sinners to the Church, but of obtaining for them remission of sins, we ought to be very explicit in warning sinners, that they are not to expect divine forgiveness in any other way, or on any other terms. How strongly both Scripture and our Church bear testimony on the opposite side, appears in some measure by what is said in the text. But it is only justice to our own Divines to add, that the most eminent of them, who rate as high as any the value of *godly discipline* to a Church, and deplore as much as any the want of it in our own, are no less clear against this grievous error of making it necessary to the remission of sins. \* Tract, No. 69, p. 207.

words of invitation we may use to them we are not told, but we are told what it is, at the most and best, that they can obtain by repentance,—that it is "*a sort of restoration* of that life [the life given in Baptism] given to those to whom it is given by virtue of that ordinance; a restoration of *a certain portion* of their Baptismal health. It is not *the* new birth simply, that is Baptism, but it is a revival *in a measure*, of that life; to be received gratefully, as a renewal of *a portion* of that former gift; to be exulted in, because it is life; but to be received and guarded with trembling, because it is the renewal of what had been forfeited; not to be boasted of, because it is but *a fragment* of an inheritance, 'wasted in riotous living,'"

Certainly if this were the message which you have to deliver, it were of less importance that you should be persuaded to *reserve* it. But, blessed be God! it is not. And if the writer of the Tract had paused to remember the whole of the passage from which he takes the last words that I have quoted from him, one might hope that he would have been preserved from the very unscriptural limitations of God's mercy to repentant sinners into which he has been led by his own theories, and by the authority of some of the fathers.\* For the prodigal in the memorable parable from which these

\* In fact whatever colour of Scriptural proof there may be for excluding from pardon those who have fallen from grace, i. is presumed that for this notion, that they are half-forgiven or half-restored, there is no shadow of foundation in Scripture. The following is the way in which the parables in Luke xv. are treated by Mr. Wordsworth, in the Appendix to his sermon on Evangelical Repentance. He gives a synopsis of the texts quoted by the various commentators on our Articles in support of the principles laid down in Article xvi. (most of which he pronounces inapplicable,) and in the course of it we have these remarkable parables thus succinctly disposed of: 'Luke xv. 7-10. Indicative of God's goodness.' 'Luke xv. 11-32. Indicative of God's mercy and goodness; with *immediate* reference to the conversion of the Gentiles, and to the uncharitable conduct of the Pharisees and Scribes towards the Publicans.' Few will question that these parables are '*indicative* of God's mercy and goodness.' But I can hardly think that there are many who will regard this as a full or fair account of their bearing upon the question of the *place for forgiveness*, which is, according to Scripture, to be allowed to such as fall into sin after Baptism, and truly repent thereof. One would have thought, indeed, that it was hard to avoid noticing, as affecting their bearing

words are taken, was a *SON*; and he had *wasted his substance with riotous living*; and yet when he came to himself, and returned to his father, we know how he was received; that though all that he sued for, and thought himself worthy of, was the place of a *servant*, his father did not ratify the sentence of his self-abasement, but opened his arms and his heart and his house to him as his *SON*, and commanded his whole household to rejoice, because *his SON who had been dead, was alive again, because he who had been lost was found*. And in one of the parables delivered in the same connexion, your Master not only encourages you, if you lose one of the sheep intrusted to your care, to go after that which is lost until you find it,—yea, to seek it with a solicitude which may banish from your thoughts the part of your charge which is safe—but allows you too, when you have brought the wanderer back, to rejoice over him; and gives you the happy assurance that the angels of God are sharing in your joy. You will hardly require a more express warrant for proclaiming to all sinners, that, if they will turn and repent, their heavenly Father is willing to receive them, to heal their backslidings, to love them freely, to restore them to the place and the privileges of His children. And I trust you will require something more than any theories, ancient or modern, about the nature of post-baptismal sin, to warrant you in putting any limitations upon the mercy and love of our Heavenly Father to every sinner that repenteth, thus solemnly and affectingly declared by Christ Himself.\*

on this particular question, that it is a sheep of the man's flock which goes astray; a part of the treasure of the woman of the house which is lost; a son of the master of the family that wanders away. And that in each case, when that which was lost is found, it is restored to its former place with rejoicing. And that our Church takes this view of the special force of the parable of the prodigal son, is very clearly stated in the Homily on Repentance, Part 1. 'Whereby [by Joel ii.] we are admonished that repentance is never too late, so that it be true and earnest. For, sith that God in the Scriptures will be called our Father, doubtless he doth follow the nature and property of gentle and merciful fathers, which seek nothing so much as the returning again and amendment of their children: as Christ doth abundantly teach in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

\* The Lord Himself very solemnly and distinctly cuts off one class of sinners from hopes of divine mercy. But this is not even of the nature of an exception to what is else-

I trust you are in little danger of being beguiled by any such presumptuous speculations into exchanging the large commission which you have received from your divine Master, for one framed more in accordance with the narrow mind and narrow heart of man. And I willingly excuse myself and you the task of a detailed examination of the arbitrary sophistry by which the testimony of Scripture against these human limitations of the ministry of reconciliation is silenced or perverted.\* I will only remind you how careful our Church has been to show herself guiltless in this matter. First, the XVIIth Article fairly interpreted, would seem to express her principles with sufficient distinctness upon the question. 'Not every deadly sin<sup>†</sup> willingly commit-

where said of God's readiness to receive and forgive every repentant sinner, if, as appears from the particular case which draws these awful words from Him, the irremissible sin of which He speaks, is one, which, from its nature shuts the sinner out from repentance. But it is unnecessary to consider this, as no attempt is, or indeed from the nature of the case could be, made to found any of the limitations to the offers of divine mercy upon this passage. The passage in Heb. vi., also a very awful one, is resorted to in the case, but it is explained by a great majority of commentators, of widely different doctrinal views, of such a renunciation of the faith as is identical with, or rather falls under, the sin against the Holy Ghost. Other expositions of the passage, which would make it equally inapplicable, we need not notice, because this is the view of its meaning on which it is set aside in the argument on this Sixteenth Article by our Church, in the Homily on Repentance: 'And that they [the Novatians] may give the better colour unto their pestilent and pernicious error, they do commonly bring in the sixth and tenth chapters of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the second chapter of the second epistle of Peter; not considering that in those places the holy apostles do not speak of the daily falls that we, as long as we carry about this body of sin, are subject unto; but of the final falling away from Christ and his Gospel, which is a sin against the Holy Ghost, that shall never be forgiven, because that they do utterly forsake the known truth, do hate Christ and his word, they do crucify and mock him, but to their utter destruction, and therefore fall into utter desperation, and cannot repent.'

\* See Note B at the end.

† It can hardly be necessary to vindicate our Church from the imputation of adopting with this word, the false and dangerous error with respect to the true nature of sin, upon which the distinction of it into *mortal* and *venial* is founded. But as the language used about the Article seems so often to countenance or assume this false principle, it cannot be out of place to give the grave caution of



ted after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance\* is not to be de-

the Bishop of Exeter against it. 'Nor may we forget the tendency of such language to encourage the pernicious and perilous habit of distinguishing between such sins as may destroy our state of grace and such as we may think still leave that state secure. Let it never be absent from our minds, that every wilful sin is deadly—and let us beware of hardening our own hearts, and corrupting the hearts of our brethren—by whispering to ourselves or them which sin is more or less deadly than others. That which we may deem the least, will be deadly enough, if unrepented to work our perdition:—those which we deem the most deadly will, if repented, have been thoroughly washed away in the blood of our Redeemer.'—Charge, 1830, p. 83.

\* These words, which seem very plain, have given occasion to a very curious gloss. Referring to them, Mr. Wordsworth writes, "Is there then no cause to fear—I ask fearfully, and with all due deference and humility—lest we be condemned out of our own mouth? May it not be said—and not indeed without reason—that we ourselves do in a manner deny the place of forgiveness, which we have so long discontinued? Where are now appointed stations of 'the mourners,' or of 'the prostrate?' Where is now 'the rod of discipline, the robe of shame?'" According to this most extraordinary perversion of the Article, it is not intended to blame the unscriptural rigour which pronounces deadly sin after baptism to be irremissible, but the unprimitive laxity which does not assign a distinct place in the Church (separate from that of the faithful worshipper, and with suitable accompaniments of shame and suffering) to those who have been guilty of such sin! And in an explanatory note (which to most readers will appear very necessary) he refers to Dr. Hey on the Articles, vol. iii. p. 455, who finds that in 1552, *locus penitentiae*, in the Latin Article, was rendered in the English, by the place for penitents. While in 1571, the Latin being still the same, the English was the grant of repentance, and hence he infers that 'the grant of repentance must mean the same with the place for penitents, otherwise they could not both be English for the same Latin.' 'The meaning then seems to be, that heinous offenders may be permitted to have some place in the Church, not the place of such as are at peace with discipline, and under no censure, but that of those who have been in some way degraded, and are labouring to recover their former station.' Upon this Mr. Wordsworth says, 'This argument, though not perhaps quite conclusive, is confirmed by the statement in the Homily referred to above,' i. e. The Homily for Whitsunday, in which one of the notes of the true Church is said to be 'the right use of Ecclesiastical Discipline.') It seems strange that Dr. Hey, having taken so much pains to put himself wrong, should

nied to such as fall into sin [i. e. (as is evident from the connexion) though it be deadly and willingly committed,] after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.' And in the Homily on Justification, after stating the plain impossibility of our being justified and made righteous before God by our own acts, words, and deeds, seem they never so good, 'because all men be sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of his law and commandments,' the Church declares the necessity of seeking "another righteousness or justification to be received at God's own hands; that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and trespasses in such things as he hath offended." And she teaches that 'this justification or righteousness which we do receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.'" And

not have taken the very little more which would have set him right. In 1552, in Article XVI. (Latin) we have *locus penitentiae* twice, meaning in both places evidently the same thing, and accordingly in both it is in the English rendered by the place for penitents, as Dr. Hey notices. It is not easy to believe that, even then, though an expression is used which might suggest a different purpose, the Article had any other object than to condemn the grievous error by which the general declarations of God's mercy to repentant sinners were unscripturally limited, in the case of the baptized, to what were styled venial sins. But be this as it may, it is very clear that in the subsequent revisions very special pains were taken to fix this to be the true meaning of the Article. In 1562, the Latin still remaining the same, the words where they first occur in the Article are rendered by the place for penitence, a sufficiently significant alteration in itself. But still more distinctly, where they occur again, the English is, the place of forgiveness. In 1571, the deviation is still wider, it is, the graunte of repentance in the first place, and the place of forgiveness, in the second. Nor is this all, for the Latin was altered this year for the first time; the first *locus penitentiae* being suffered to stand, but the second being changed to *locus veniae*. It does not appear easily how it could have been more distinctly declared that *locus penitentiae*, does not mean the place for penitents, in the sense assigned to the words by Dr. Hey and Mr. Wordsworth.

lest it should be alleged (in the spirit in which very many clear authorities, scriptural and other, are dealt with) that there is nothing here to show that sin after baptism is contemplated, it is fortunate that the Homily goes on to say expressly: 'Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven. And they which in act and deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, *that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation.*' I quote the rather from this Homily, because, as you remember, its statement of the true doctrine of justification is specially adopted in the eleventh Article, as setting forth more at length the doctrine which the Church intends there to state. But equally clear statements are to be found elsewhere in the same volume: as in the Homily on Repentance: 'Whereupon, we do not without a good cause detest and abhor the damnable opinion of them which do most wickedly go about to persuade the simple and ignorant people, that if we chance, after we be once come to God, and grafted in his Son Jesus Christ, to fall into some horrible sin, repentance shall be unprofitable unto us, there is no more hope of reconciliation, or to be received again into the mercy and favour of God.' And setting aside the support which is attempted to be procured for 'this pestilent and pernicious error' from Heb. vi. and x. and 2 Peter ii. it adds, 'And that this is the true meaning of the Holy Spirit of God, it appeareth by many other places of the Scriptures, which promise unto all true repentant sinners, and to them that with their whole heart do turn unto the Lord their God, free pardon and remission of their sins.' And then alleging in proof of this doctrine, the invitations and promises of the ancient prophets, it subjoins the following comment upon them. 'It is most evident and plain that these things ought to be understood of them that were with the Lord before, and by their sins and wickednesses were gone away from him. For we do not turn again unto him with whom we were never before, but we come unto Him. Now unto all them that will return unfeignedly unto the Lord their God, the favour and mercy of God unto

forgiveness of sins is liberally offered." And so elsewhere.\*

But more cannot be needed to clear our Church from all participation in this very grievous error. Whether holding back the word of life, or thus adulterating it when you preach it, be the more criminal and destructive unfaithfulness to the ministry of reconciliation with which you are intrusted, we need not determine. I trust you will not be guilty of either. Certainly you will in vain look for aid or countenance in either, from the Church of which you are ministers. I trust you will declare the Gospel as unreservedly as she encourages you to do, and as freely and as fully as she declares it for you in her formularies; and "*that both publicly, and from house to house; testifying to ALL, after the example of the great apostle, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.*" It was the consciousness that he had thus unreservedly testified of the *gospel of the grace of God*, to those among whom he had ministered, which as you know gave him comfort and peace when he was about to part from them for ever. Not that he did not distinctly recognize different stages of the Christian course, to which different modes of teaching, and different measures of knowledge were appropriate. He elsewhere expressly refers to *babes in Christ*, as existing in His Church, as well as mature Christians, and as needing different nutriment from the full grown. And no doubt he felt, in its place, the importance of wisely administering to those committed to his care, the discipline and the instruction which each successive stage of the Christian life requires. But it was not his discharge of this part of his duty, which pressed upon his mind at this trying moment. There was a work to be done for all and in all, before this economy had any place,—a work in which the safety of their souls was involved. And it was to his faithfulness in the discharge of this part of his office,—that he had done what in him lay, to bring all among whom he had ministered to the knowledge of themselves as sinners, and of Christ as the Saviour of sinners,—it was to his faithfulness in this part of his high office that he looked for peace, when he was about to lay it down. I trust you will imitate his faithfulness, and so earn his peace: that you will call upon ALL sin-

\* See, for example, the Second Sermon on the Passion.



ners to repent, and ALL to believe the Gospel; offering to ALL free pardon and full acceptance in Christ's name. And that so when you come to lay down *the ministry which you have received of the Lord Jesus*, and to bid farewell to those *among whom you have gone preaching the kingdom of God*, you may enjoy the comfort which sustained the Apostle Paul in the same trying season, and feel with him, that *you are pure from the blood of all men*, your conscience bearing you witness, *that you have not shunned to declare unto them ALL THE COUNSEL OF GOD.*

I believe I may now release you from the prolonged review in which I have found it necessary to engage you. I fear it has been an irksome task, but I did not feel that I could avoid imposing it on you. Of all the errors of our day, many and grievous as they are, the two which we have been considering appear the most deadly—the most certain, if they prevail, to quench the light which the Church was intended to hold up in the midst of this fallen world. And aiming, as they do, at restraining or nullifying *the word of reconciliation* intrusted to you, they lay so directly in my way in speaking to you of your ministerial duties, that I could not avoid distinctly noticing them. And finally, as in recommending them, or defending them, they both, particularly the first, have at different times assumed somewhat different shapes, I have thought it necessary, at whatever cost of time, to make you fully understand what they are, as well as what are the grounds upon which they rest.

I make no doubt that some of my hearers think that I have imposed upon them and upon myself a very superfluous labour, in examining at such length arguments so weak, in support of errors so gross and palpable; and that an enterprise at once so desperate and so feebly supported, might have been safely left to itself, with little anxiety about the result. But it is never safe to calculate upon the effects of any arguments, without taking into account the state of feeling of those to whom they are addressed. Prepossessions for or against what it is intended to establish, can give strength to the weakest reasoning, and neutralize the force of the strongest. And for the false teaching which we have been reviewing, preparation was made so perseveringly and so successfully, that, though it has been resolutely rejected by a great majority of the

ministers and the members of the Church, it has been gladly received and acted on by a minority, which is not inconsiderable in point of numbers, and which is most formidable, as possessing in an eminent degree the characteristic combination, and zeal, and energy, of the aggressive party. How this party has been formed, and what its present state is, all who hear me, in a general way know. It is known, that is, to every one, that a *movement* has been going on for some years, originating with certain members of the University of Oxford, which had for its professed object to bring our Church back to her true principles, from which, from various unfavourable circumstances in her position, she was represented as having widely strayed. And it is also known, that this movement has for some time gone so far beyond its ostensible object, as to alarm not a few even of those who looked upon it at first with approbation and hope. Every one must have this kind of general knowledge of the history of this remarkable movement. But it is to be expected that there are many who only know it in some such way; who soon learned enough of its nature and objects to feel satisfied that neither for their own edification, nor for that of their flocks, were they concerned to know more; and who felt, that as neither were disturbed or likely to be disturbed by it, they had no motive or good excuse for spending the time which their active labours left for preparation for the instruction of their people, in such study of the various publications of this party as might enable them to watch and note its progress. I should be sorry to turn any aside from this quiet and useful course into the thorny and unprofitable paths of controversy. But it is evidently desirable that now every minister of the Church should know something more than this of a party, in the very bosom of our Church, possessed of such widespread influence, of such activity, ability, watchfulness and perseverance, and who have given such indications of their principles and designs as to make their growing strength a natural cause of alarm to all who value the blessings of sound doctrine and pure worship, which the Reformation has obtained for us. Even what I have already brought before you of their principles, ought to be enough to make you regard the present state of this party as a matter of pressing practical interest. And the course by which it has arrived at this state—could it be accurately reviewed

—would be found pregnant with instruction and warning. I cannot attempt to supply this knowledge fully, or indeed to do more than very slightly to glance at the details of this instructive history. But, however far short what I shall be able to say must be from a full account of the rise and progress of this movement in the Church, and however superfluous it may be for some, I hope it may give some useful information to not a few of those to whom I speak.

The first open indications of the movement, were a series of publications under the title of "Tracts for the Times," the declared object of which was to aid the rulers of the Church to meet the difficulties with which they had to contend, by stirring up her ministers to remember and assert the power which had been bestowed upon them at their ordination, and by giving her lay-members better information concerning her constitution and principles,—by imparting to them clearer views of the foundation of her claims to authority, and by making them understand better the privileges which they enjoyed in her communion.

These were important services. But the principles on which, and the mode in which, they were to be rendered, were matters of no mean importance too. And I cannot but think that, comparatively cautious as were the first steps of the party, even in their very earliest efforts, there was not a little which ought to have suggested that this grave enterprise was not in very safe hands. But there was much in the circumstances of the times to procure a very lenient judgment for any efforts which were made in this cause. In the first place, in the Church itself, the current had set strongly in against those erroneous or loose notions upon the authority of the Church, which give license to self-government within it, or to actual secession from its pale. I do not mean that such notions and their natural effects, had ceased to exist, but that within the Church itself there was a real and healthy reaction in favour of authority and order, with which this movement fell in, though it has pushed it to so unhealthy an extreme. And in the second place, as to its outward relations, there was much at the time to alarm and exasperate Churchmen, in the use which Dissenters, both Romanist and Protestant, were already making, of the great accessions of power which they had then but recently obtained. And as in their

concurrent assaults upon the Church, the latter were taking a course more in opposition to the religious principles which they professed than the former; they not unnaturally became the chief objects of indignation. Some measure of hostility to the Established Church might have been excused in Dissenters, as, though not involved in the principle of Dissent, yet, from the imperfection of our nature, a consequence practically of the profession of dissent, which is unhappily too common to excite much surprise or resentment. But the bitterness of this hostility, and some of the modes of manifesting it, and the unprincipled alliances to which it led, admitted of no excuse. And, as is always the case in hasty judgments, a portion of the discredit which fell most justly upon those inconsistent *Protestants*, was extended to the principles which they dishonoured. And the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, which they as well as we profess, in addition to all the prejudices which their own nature always raises against them, had to encounter a new one, with many, at that time, as seeming to form a link between us and Dissenters: while, for the same reason, the doctrinal errors of Rome, and all those vices of her system which they as well as we reject and oppose, seemed to be viewed by many with mitigated aversion and dread.

These causes, and others on which I do not think it profitable to enlarge, had prepared so favourable a reception for the Tracts, that they soon obtained a considerable hold on the public mind, in spite, as I have intimated, of some indications of principles which, under other circumstances, could hardly have failed to excite very general distrust and alarm. Such apprehensions might not, perhaps, have been warranted by the bare fact, that in these writings Church polity, and rites and ceremonies, seemed to be the only subjects connected with religion which were considered worthy of serious interest; because it might be pleaded that the very object of the Tracts being to correct the errors which prevailed upon such matters, and especially the great error of undervaluing them, they were naturally driven into some measure of the exclusiveness and excess complained of. But though this excuse ought, no doubt, to go for a good deal, it could not reach to all that it had to account for. For it was in various ways made evident that the large and prominent place which



these subjects occupied in their publications, was not due to any temporary causes, but was an essential characteristic of the religious system of the writers.

Upon such points some difference of views has, if not always, certainly for a long time, existed among sound and attached members of our Church. And that the writers of the Tracts took one side in these differences, and maintained it strongly, could be no just ground of accusation against them; though it of course would have sometimes been made a charge, whichever side they had taken. But the fact was, that upon some of these questions their views went far beyond those of any of the Divines who had gone before them, that is, of any who had any reputation in the Church, for soundness and sobriety. For example:—All our great Divines, who maintain the reality and the advantages of a succession from the Apostles' time, of Episcopally-consecrated Bishops, and Episcopally-ordained Ministers in the Church, and who rejoice in the possession of it by our own Church as a signal blessing and privilege, not only did not maintain that it is absolutely essential to the being of the Church, but are at pains to make it clear, that they do not hold that it is. Whereas one of the fundamental principles of the writers of the Tracts is, that the CHURCH is made up of those who are under such a ministry, to the exclusion of all others. And further they maintain that Sacramental grace is so connected with the Apostolical succession, that religious communities not enjoying the latter, are necessarily shut out from the benefit of the Sacraments, which are 'generally necessary to salvation.' "A person not commissioned from the Bishop, may use the words of Baptism and sprinkle or bathe with the water, but there is no promise from Christ, that such a man shall admit souls to the *kingdom of heaven*. A person not commissioned may break bread and pour out wine, but it can afford no comfort to any to receive it at his hands; because there is no warrant from Christ to lead communicants to suppose that while he does so here on earth, they will be partakers in the Saviour's *heavenly* body and blood."\* And again:—And this is a matter pertaining to each man's salvation. For that bread and cup are the appointed mean, whereby the faithful are to partake of CHRIST's body and

blood offered for their sins. . . . .

In the judgment of the Church it makes no less difference that this: Whether the bread and cup which he partakes of shall be to him CHRIST's body and blood or no. I repeat it: in the judgment of the Church, the eucharist administered without Apostolical commission, may to pious minds be a very edifying ceremony, but it is not that blessed thing which our SAVIOUR graciously meant it to be: it is not 'verily and indeed taking and receiving' the body and blood of Him, our incarnate Lord."\*

Their view of the Eucharist was, that besides the *communion*, it contained a *sacrifice* commemorative, and impetratory or propitiatory. The proper effect of *communion* was 'the strengthening and refreshing of the soul;' although, inasmuch as it united the believer with CHRIST, it *indirectly* conveyed remission of sins. But it was by the *sacrifice* that this blessing was, directly and properly, procured. The sacrifice was offered for the whole Church, the living and the departed in Christ, and procured for both the blessings of His death, as they were applicable to each; for the Church on earth, remission of sins; for those who had entered the unseen state, increased spiritual enjoyment, and fuller disclosures of the beatific vision. It was of course as consecrated and offered by a priest, that it was in either way efficacious. And the sacramental grace was so connected with the symbols by the act of consecration, that they became thenceforth endued, as it seemed, with an abiding property or quality, whereby they imparted grace to the soul, not by any moral process,—through an operation on the mind or affections,—but directly; insomuch that it was regarded as among the evidences which appear in our day, of an imperfect apprehension of the consequences and effects of the Apostolical commission, even among those who believed it, that it would be maintained 'by most men, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, was a superstition.'†

\* No. 52, p. 7.

† Advertisement to the *Second Volume of the Tracts*. 'We have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplation, or (*what is called*) *communion*

It could hardly be surprising, if with such views, our differences with Rome in doctrine, were regarded as a light thing, compared with our differences with Protestants abroad and at home. And such was the case. The writers valued themselves upon occupying, what according to them was the position which our Church had chosen for itself, a just mean between Romanism and Protestantism, freed from the corruptions of the former, and secured from the irregularities of the latter. But without stopping to inquire how far this is an exact description of the position which the Church desires to occupy, it was very clear that they were not prepared to maintain it fairly. In spite of very hard things said from time to time against Popery, it was impossible not to feel that their general tone was much more decidedly Anti-Protestant, than not Roman. Indeed, a

*with God*, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the Church and her Sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul, what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, 'would not most men maintain, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? And yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage.' This seems to have been felt to be too strong, and it was altered thus: 'For example, would not most men maintain, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and *apparently* insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, *must be, under all circumstances and in every conceivable case*, a superstition? And yet, *neither practice is without* the sanction of primitive usage.' These changes make the passage sound somewhat less startling, but they are really either deceptions or unmeaning. To take the first, What is meant by the addition of *apparently* to *insensible*? Does it not seem to intimate that the Author did not mean to deny, that to administer the Lord's Supper to one who was *really* insensible, would be a superstition? that he only meant to plead that those who would administer the rite to one who *appears* to be insensible, are not to be arraigned as necessarily guilty of this superstition? Must not this be supposed to be his meaning, in order to give any force, or even sense, to this addition? And yet any one who considers the whole passage, will see that this could not have been what was intended by the author; and that what he must have meant was what he first wrote, viz., that to regard as superstitious, the administering of the Lord's Supper to the insensible, is a proof of an imperfect apprehension of the extent of the apostolic commission, and a proof of rationalistic and carnal views of the holy Sacrament.

leaning towards Rome, and against the Reformation, was soon visible, and became more apparent as they went on. At first, though much anxiety was evinced to separate our cause from that of the Continental Reformers, even they were spoken of with forbearance, if not with respect. But, whatever became of them, a clear distinction in favour of our own Reformation was strongly maintained. And when principles were stated, or arguments employed, which seemed to make against its lawfulness, pains were sometimes taken to show that they did not apply to *it*, or that there was something to lessen their force, as applied to it. It unfortunately happened, not unfrequently, that the charge was very insufficiently removed by the defence. But even when such apologies were most successful, their effect was, to present it rather as a procedure which might be justified, and which did not destroy the constitution and authority of the Church, than as a needful purification and renovation of the Church, to which its members were to be taught to look back with exultation and thankfulness. And the references to this great event became less and less calculated to inspire such feelings, and seemed rather designed to give a painful impression of the violence and irregularity which accompanied it,—of the weakness of the chief agents engaged in it,—of the evil influences under which they acted,—and of the imperfections of the work which they accomplished. A reader of the Tracts might find it hard to determine what, in the judgment of the writers, we had gained by the Reformation, and what was its value; but he could not doubt that in their judgment we had lost much, and much which they regarded as of no mean importance.

It was very plain, in the first place, that the great Doctrines then restored to the Church found but very little favour in their eyes. In the Tracts, and the other publications of the School, the great doctrine of Justification by Faith only, was either passed over in silence, or brought forward to be misrepresented, or disparaged, or explained away, or opposed. The great principle concerning the Rule of Faith, which is our only security for the permanent enjoyment of that doctrine, or of any other, was denied, or received with a qualification, which robbed it of its truth and its power.\*

\* "True, the intelligible argument of Ultra-



The labours of our Reformers to restore the purity of public worship, fared hardly, if at all better. Here, as before, I shall give but one or two examples, out of the number that offer themselves. The judgment passed upon what was done in the matter of the Eucharist, will afford a striking example of the tendency of these writings, not only to disparage the Reformers, but to lower the Church itself, in the eyes of its members, to impair their value for its services, and to fill them with an uneasy craving for something more catholic and primitive, than they enjoyed in its communion. A practical grievance, it was allowed, was redressed, when the cup was restored to the laity; and it was also admitted, that in rejecting transubstantiation, a doctrinal error was taken away, though what the nature and amount of it was, in their estimation, might be felt to be somewhat doubtful. The same may be said of purgatory, as connected with the rite. And then the doctrine of *intention*, and the necessity of confession, created a painful uncertainty whether the benefit of the sacrament was received. But against the benefits bestowed by taking these errors and burdens away, there was a great deal to be set on the opposite side. A Tract (No. 63,) was devoted to the examination of the ancient liturgies, and the result presented to the reader was, that there are four independent forms to which all liturgies which exist, or which it is likely ever have existed, may be reduced, and that these are, most probably, of Apostolic origin. Indeed, this is the solemn conclusion concerning them, 'It may perhaps be said, without exaggeration, that next to the Holy Scriptures, they possess the greatest claim on our veneration and study.' Now, from all these it is explicitly noted, that our office differs in some important points, and the materials are provided for every reader to determine for himself, that it differs in more particulars than the author states, or I suppose would choose to acknowledge. And it is right to add, that the

canon of the Mass is one of these four independent and Apostolic forms, and that it is styled 'the Liturgy of St. Peter.' In a later Tract, (No. 81,) which contains the doctrinal view of the Eucharist before referred to, there is a historical account of the way in which that doctrine has been dealt with in our Church. The result of which is, that while it was questionable whether the framers of Edward's first service had not gone too far, 'in altering the ancient Liturgy of the Church,' from anxiety to correct errors, and take stumbling-blocks out of the way, there can be no doubt that by the subsequent changes which they made, in obedience to the suggestions of foreign Reformers, "the whole doctrine of the Eucharist was altered." In fact, "all the alterations went one way, to introduce the Zuinglian view of a simple commemoration, for the Catholic doctrine of actual communion." And to these unhappy changes the writer ascribes unhesitatingly the neglect of the Rite, which has gone on increasing down to our own times. "It makes, in truth, a man's 'eyes gush out with water' to see in these notices how the glory of our Church, the days of her youth and her first love, are departed, and to think of what she might have been had she stood in the old paths. 'The virgin daughter of my people is broken with a great breach, and a very heavy blow.'"

The revision under Elizabeth brought back a few important words of the first service. It was so far as it went, a useful change, but it was trifling compared with what was to be done, "the confession of the true doctrine had been once half suppressed, and was not now more than half avowed." After the Savoy Conference, a Rubric which belonged to the first service was restored, and an important word was introduced but the service remained in every thing else as before. In noticing these later revisions, and indeed in going through the service in detail, it is the object of the writer to show that there is a recognition of what he regards as the true doctrine, not only to commend this view of the doctrine to his readers, but also as a justification of himself and his friends, for submitting to the use of the office as we have it. And for this purpose there is a great effort made to show, that however 'veiled or lowered' the true doctrine of the sacrifice was in the second service, it was still left there, and that it was still more clearly in the

---

Protestantism may be taken, and we may say, 'the Bible, and nothing but the Bible,' but this is an unthankful rejection of another great gift, equally from God, such as no true Anglican can tolerate. If, on the other hand, we proceed to take the *sounder view*, that the Bible is the *record* of necessary truth, or of matters of faith, and the Church Catholic's tradition is the *interpreter of it*," &c. No. 71, p. 8.

subsequent additions. Upon these points a great deal of sophistry is expended. But we have no concern with them which would warrant us in stopping to review it. Supposing it to be ever so successful in showing that the service may be borne with, it does nothing more; and it does nothing at all, and was intended to do nothing, for those who framed it. As regards *them*, the statements of doctrine and facts in the *Tract* retain their proper effect. And certainly their tendency is to produce in those who receive them, the state of feeling, which is so undisguisedly expressed in other publications of the writers of the *Tracts*,—‘feelings of indignation and impatient sorrow,’ at the conduct of those who, *having received whole and entire from their predecessors, that sacred and most precious monument of the Apostles, St. Peter’s Liturgy, mutilated the tradition of fifteen hundred years.*\*

I shall give but one other instance of the way in which these publications exhibit the effects of what was done for the Church at the Reformation, in the matter of public worship.

A history, an analysis, and very copious specimens of the Breviary, are given in a *Tract*, (which occupies above two hundred closely-printed octavo pages) for the professed purpose of acquainting the members of our Church with the treasures which it contains. And this, it is said, to guard against the impression which must be made in favour of the Church of Rome, if they suddenly learned that she possessed services of such excellence and beauty. To obviate such dangers, they are set before the reader, with the information that the treasure, with the exception of some corruptions, which it owes to Rome, belongs to the Church Catholic, and therefore is as much ours as the Romanists.’ If this point could be established, it would certainly take away from the credit of the Church of Rome as the inventor of these services, (a claim, which of course she never made, but would be much aggrieved by having it established for her,) but it would raise her credit immeasurably as the preserver and possessor of such treasures. And it is hardly necessary to say what would be its effect, as to their feelings towards our own Church, upon any readers whom the writers succeeded in inspiring with their own admiration of

these offices. They were told indeed that they were theirs as well as the Romanists. What they knew was, that they were in the Reformers’ hands, and by them deliberately rejected from the service which they provided for their own Church. And that the wrong so committed had never been redressed in any of the authoritative revisions of the Reformers’ labours which have since taken place. And that so, in point of fact, our Church withheld them from its members up to this hour: while the Church of Rome preserved them un mutilated, though in some degree corrupted by later additions; which they were assured were easily detected and removed.

The *Tract* furnished, it is true, two services, *for social or private worship*, on the same model. One for Bishop Ken’s day, and another for Commemorations of the Dead. But when these came to be used, *socially or solitarily*, with their proper appendages of Invitatories, Antiphons, Responses, and Benedictions, however fitted they were to fill the worshipper with gratitude to the authors of the *Tracts*, it may be doubted whether they were likely to inspire him with the like sentiments towards the Reformers who had robbed him of his patrimony; or indeed towards his own Church, which still withheld it from him; and, if he desired to enjoy services of such ‘beauty and excellence,’ compelled him to celebrate them in solitude, or at least, in privacy.

And what provisions did these publications make to repress the aspirations after a return to communion with Rome, which this and such like rash or insidious representations were so fitted to raise? The authors were not insensible to the danger that existed, that such feelings would be produced, though they were not disposed to acknowledge their own share in exciting them. But they represented the Romanists as spreading themselves on all sides, and vaunting of their success real or apparent, and taunting us with our inability to argue with them. This inability, with something more than candour, they were ready to acknowledge, confessing that neglect of proper preparation through long security, and through contempt for the Romish cause, had left us, in the general unarmed for the conflict, so that, in fact, it found us “ignorant why we are not Roman Catholics.” Then, the novelty, and other stimulants of popular devotion, in which the Roman sys-

\* See Newman’s *Letter to Dr. Faussett*.



tem abounds, and the "intrinsic majesty and truth which remain in it, amid its corruptions," must be attractive to different persons in different degrees. "And further, there will ever be a number of refined and affectionate minds, who, disappointed in finding full matter for their devotional feelings in the English system, as at present conducted, betake themselves, through human frailty, to Rome." Again, there is danger from their arguments. To protect the members of the Church under these varied dangers (which it presents at somewhat greater length,) a Tract was provided, which professes to give the reasons "why we remain separate from Rome." Now, though there are parts of the Tract which are sound and forcible, it may be very safely said, that their value is far more than counterbalanced by the low and dispiriting tone which it adopts throughout, by its gross exaggeration of the difficulties of the controversy, and of the unpreparedness of the Church to engage in it; and not less by the false view which it gives of the real state of our differences with Rome, and of the duties of our clergy with reference to them.

We are told, that 'the Gospel of Christ is not a matter of mere argument; it does not follow that we are wrong and they are right, because we cannot defend ourselves.' But at all events, 'There is no plea for calling on us in England to do more than this—to defend ourselves. We are under no constraint to go out of our way spontaneously, to prove charges against the Romanists; but when asked about our faith, we can give a reason why we are of this way of thinking, and not that. This makes our task in the controversy incomparably easier than if we were forced to exhibit an offensive front or volunteer articles of impeachment against the rival communion.\* "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called," is St. Paul's direction. We find ourselves under the Anglican regimen, let every one of us, cleric and laymen, remain in it, till our opponents have shown cause why we

should change, till we have reason to suspect that we are wrong. . . . . We have the strength of possession and prescription: we are not *obliged* to prove them incurably corrupt and heretical: no, nor our own system unexceptionable. . . . . The only conceivable causes of leaving its communion are, I suppose, the two following; first, that it is involved in some damnable heresy; or secondly, that it is not in possession of the Sacraments. . . . . Thus, then, we stand as regards Romanism. Strictly speaking, and in the eyes of soberly religious men, it ought not to be embraced, even could it be made appear in some points superior to (what is now practically) the Anglican system; St. Paul even advising a slave to remain a slave, though he had the option of liberty. . . . . 'While we are able to maintain the claim of our clergy to the ministration of the Sacraments, and our freedom from any deadly heresy, we have nothing to fear from any historical disclosures which the envy of adversaries might contrive against our Church, or from any external appearances which it may present at this day to the superficial observer. Whatever may be the past mistakes of individual members of it, or the tyranny of aliens over it, or its accidental connexion with Protestant persuasions, still these hinder not its having "the ministration of the Word and Sacraments;" and having them, it has sufficient claims on our filial devotion and love.'

It is acknowledged, however, that though this is sufficient for sober, and religious, and rational men, yet, for men as they are, something more striking, and energetic, and *offensive*, will be required, and directions accordingly are given for managing the controversy in this way. And we are advised, for various reasons, to abstain from several which have been rather favourite points in the warfare hitherto—as the supremacy of the Pope, the Rule of Faith, and Transubstantiation. The reasons for this strange counsel are at least as bad as the counsel itself, falling in with it in suggesting, if they do not directly admit, that upon these important points, the difference between the Romish and the true view, if any, is slight and shadowy, matter of subtle disquisition and learned argument, but for the many, hard to determine and not very important.\*

\* It is not very easy to understand how it is proposed to reconcile this view of the duty of ministers of the Church of England, with the solemn engagement which they are required to make, in what the first Tract rightly calls 'the most solemn season of their lives,' that they will be ready, God being their helper, 'with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word.'

\* 'This consideration will lead us to put in

Moreover, though the Tract enlarges upon some heads of difference upon which we may safely and prudently assail Rome, the Romish doctrine of Justification does not appear either among the points upon which discussion is permitted, nor among those on which it is discountenanced; so as to convey not unnaturally that the impression of the writer is, that upon that fundamental doctrine the Church of Rome is either in no error at all, or at least none that is clear and important.

And on the whole I think, that any plain member of our Church, who takes up the Tract without any suspicion that the author was not a safe guide in such matters, must lay it down with an uneasy apprehension that the reasons *why we remain separate from Rome*, are much fewer and weaker than he had before believed. And as to those whom the Tracts had already given a strong impulse towards Rome, how much more such dissuasives were calculated to aid than to counteract the impulse, it is unnecessary to say.

The effects of all that had been done in the cause, became increasingly manifest, and in various ways. Every man's own observation within his own circle even where it was most confined, furnished him with abundant and striking proofs that these persevering labours had not been in vain. But above all, the religious publications of the day, and especially of the periodical press connected with religion, exhibited very clear and very for-

the background the controversy about the Holy Eucharist, which is almost certain to lead to profane and rationalistic thoughts in the minds of the many, and cannot well be discussed in words at all, without the sacrifice of "godly fear," *while it is well nigh anticipated by the ancient statements, and the determinations of the Church concerning the Incarnation. It is true that learned men, such as Stillingfleet, have drawn lines of distinction between the doctrine of transubstantiation, and that high mystery.* But the question is, whether they are so level to the intelligence of the many, as to secure the Anglican disputant from fostering irreverence, whether in himself or his hearers, if he ventures on such an argument. *If transubstantiation must be opposed, it is in another way; by shewing, as may well be done, and as Stillingfleet himself has done, that, in matter of fact, it was not the doctrine of the early church, but an innovation at such or such a time; a line of discussion which requires learning both to receive and appreciate.*' P. 9. See also what is said, p. 7, of the objections to prayers to saints to pray for us, and p. 8, of the papal supremacy.

midable traces of them, in the miserable trifles upon which the strength of the Church was wasted, in the arrogance and bitterness with which they were treated, and above all in the softened tone of feeling with which the errors, and superstitions, and tyranny of the Church of Rome were regarded. And yet, notwithstanding all these indications of the tendencies of this movement, the Tracts continued to retain very many of their first admirers and supporters. It perhaps would not be reasonable to be much surprised at this. But it does appear surprising, that among them there should have been any who looked back with thankfulness to the Reformation, who valued the momentous truths then recovered and secured to the Church; and who regarded, with affectionate reverence, the Martyrs and Confessors whom God had made His instruments in bestowing these signal blessings upon us. And yet so it was. Not a few who abhorred Popery underrated its strength, and regarded Protestant Dissenters as the Church's most formidable enemies. And having, at the first appearance of the Tracts, hailed their authors as powerful maintainers of the cause of the Church against Dissent, from whom the most important services were to be expected, they were very slow in relinquishing these happy anticipations, and renouncing the aid of such able auxiliaries. They were prepared to hear those who assailed Dissent upon Church principles, themselves, in return, accused of a leaning to Popery. And they hardly considered at first the evidence in support of this charge against the Tractarians with any attention. As might be expected, it was often made ignorantly, and weakly supported, and this was, of course, to strengthen the prejudice against it, even when brought forward more advisedly, and better sustained. And, as the evidence comprehended a pretty extensive induction of particulars, and even relied upon the *tone* of the writers, and other indications of their principles, which, in like manner, could only have much force, when impartially and patiently weighed, it will be easily understood, that no proofs could be offered, which such prepossessions in their favour did not easily set aside. And this result was the more natural, from the caution with which the authors of the Tracts wrote at the outset.

Comparing what they wrote with what had appeared for some time upon the same side, it was not unnatural that it



should be regarded as very bold; but, looking back at it now with the knowledge which we possess of the principles of the writers, one is certainly more struck with their caution.\* And though from time to time what seemed to be strong and distinct declarations of their principles appeared, yet upon examination they were often found less unequivocally expressed, than at first sight they were thought to be; or accompanied by some unnoticed qualifications; or when they were most tangible, there was something tangible which might be set upon the opposite side. So that when the writers were put upon their defence, either by some ambiguity in what gave occasion to the charge; or by being able to produce something like it, more or less, in some one of good reputation in the Church, or with a large party in it; or by referring to something very different in another of the Tracts, or in some other of their writings; or by retorting the charge upon those who made it,—show-

\* Many of the subsequent publications of the party, but especially Mr. Froude's Remains, throw much light upon the management and forbearance which must have been exercised in their first movements. I shall not give any of these particular indications of caution, which every one may see for himself; but the following extract on their general principles seems worth quoting. His last published letter contains the following very strong expostulation with Mr. Newman, on the excess to which such economy was carried in one of the Tracts written by the latter. 'The other day accidentally put in my way the Tract on "The Apostolical Succession in the English Church; and it really does seem so very unfair, that I wonder you could even in the extremity of *οικονομία* and *φειλακίαις* have consented to be a party to it. Vol. i. p. 425, 426.

He sustains his charge by what seems a very good argument *ad hominem* at least. But what we are concerned with, is the form in which the charge is made. There probably is an allusion in it, to Mr. Newman's commendation of the account which Clemens Alexandrinus gives of the rules which guide a Christian in speaking and acting *economically*, in which, (without using the word) he gives clear sanction to *φειλακίαις* for a good end. 'He both thinks and speaks the truth; except when consideration is necessary, and then, as a physician for the good of his patients, he will be false, or utter a falsehood, as the sophists say. "The Arians, p. 81. But it seems hard not to collect from what Mr. Froude says, that it was a settled point, that, in the position of the party, both the qualities which he mentions must be employed in their writings for the public, but that still there were limits to the use of them which ought not to be exceeded.

ing that if *they* had exceeded in one direction, their accusers, or some with whom they were understood to agree, had committed some excess in a direction less likely to be in favour with those for whom chiefly such defences were intended,—in some of these ways, or in some such way, they were always able to say so much, as to allow those who valued them as maintainers of Church authority and order, and who wished to believe them sound in doctrine, to retain their favourable opinion of them. Whatever could be defended, such persons strenuously defended; what admitted of no defence, they were content to excuse, or at most to blame gently as occasional blemishes, not affecting the general character of the series; being introduced probably into it by the imprudence of some such imprudent members as every party contains, and must at times suffer from.

All this while however the party were gaining strength and courage; and the Tracts, and still more other publications, many of them anonymous, evinced a very decided advance towards Rome, which, according to the opinion entertained of the writers, might be regarded either as an advance in the clearness of their perceptions of the consequences of their principles, or in their boldness in avowing them. The first act, however, of the party, which produced any considerable defection from its ranks, was the publication of Mr. Froude's Remains. This seemed to force upon many of their supporters, who had resisted all other evidence, some apprehension of the real direction of the movement to which they had hitherto fearlessly committed themselves. They not only saw in this publication the great leaders of the Reformation, here and upon the Continent, treated as objects of hatred and scorn, but they were left no room to doubt, that it was for their principles,—the Protestant principles which they themselves held and valued—and for the great work which they had effected, that these illustrious men were hated and reviled. The writer avows himself as 'every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation;'\* as 'thinking worse and worse of the Reformers; 'hating the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and having almost made up his mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the Revelations.† And

\* Vol. i. p. 336.

† Ibid. p. 389.

while engaged in the course of study of our ecclesiastical history which was giving him these views and feelings about the Reformers, he says, what is not surprising, 'As far as I have gone, too, I think better than I was prepared to do of Bonner and Gardiner.\* Farther on, writing to one friend he refers to a letter to another, for evidence of 'the length that he is being pulled on in Anti-Protestantism.' He regards the present Church system, which he calls 'our upas-tree,'† as 'an incubus upon the country; and gives it as his opinion that the 'Church can never right itself without a blow-up.‡ Indeed this opinion seems altogether independent of any of the evils of its state-connexion, though in the particular place it seems to be suggested by them. For his practical conclusion with respect to the Reformation itself is, that it 'was a limb badly set: it must be broken again in order to be righted.¶

But his principles and feelings as a Churchman, may be further collected from his sentiments upon a few very important points. He throws doubts upon the purity of the descent of orders in our Church.§ He describes her as having *blasphemed Tradition and the Sacraments.*¶ He not only objects to the *teaching of the prayer-book* being called *the teaching of the Church*, but (after suggesting and rejecting different supposed grounds for so regarding it) he avows distinctly that he sees 'no other claim which the prayer-book has on a layman's deference, as the teaching of the Church, which the *BREVIARY* and *MISSAL* have not in a far greater degree.\*\* Indeed he lays down this broad general principle, 'It appears to me plain that in all matters that seem to be indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken. We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the

\* P. 252.

† Upon this, apparently regarding it as rather too strong, the Editor gives the following Note: 'It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the author is speaking of the establishment, or, as he calls it, "Church system," i. e. the particular form in which the one Holy Catholic Church happens to be developed in England.' And of which, it does seem necessary to observe, the author and his annotator happened to be ordained ministers.

‡ P. 256.

¶ P. 433.

§ P. 385.

¶ P. 438.

\*\* Pp. 402, 403.

Church of Rome, that it is not a development of the apostolic *Æra*, and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the six first centuries; they must find a *disproof* if they would do anything.\* And as to the eucharist he says, 'I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the eucharist, and think that the principle on which it is founded is as proud, irreverent and foolish, as that of any heresy, even Socinianism.† He takes even the author of the *Christian Year* to task for some symptoms of this Protestant spirit! He had said (in the verses on the Gunpowder treason) of the communion, that 'the eternal Priest' is 'there present in the heart, not in the hands,' and Mr. Froude asks, 'How can we possibly know that it is true to say, "not in the hands?"'‡ He commemorates accordingly with satisfaction, the advance that one friend has made who, he verily believes 'would now gladly consent to see our communion-service replaced by a good translation of the liturgy of St. Peter;' and adds, in the way of advice to the friend to whom he communicates this intelligence, 'a name which I advise you to substitute in your notes to —, for the obnoxious phrase "mass-book,"¶

But his final conclusion seems to be, to acquiesce in the view taken by another friend of our Communion Service, and of the feelings with which it becomes those who see its defects to receive it. What this view was, appears in the passage in which he expresses his approbation of it. 'The more I think over your view about regarding our present Communion Service, &c. as a *judgment on the Church*, and taking it as the crumbs from the Apostles' table, the more I am struck with its fitness to be dwelt upon as tending to check the intrusion of irreverent thoughts, without in any way interfering with one's just indignation.¶

Such were this writer's views of the Reformation and its fruits. In exhibiting them, something has necessarily been done to show the very different feelings

\* P. 336.

† P. 391.

‡ P. 404.

¶ This advice was not thrown away, as appears from a passage often quoted from Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Faussett, Second Edition, pp. 46, 47. Mr. Froude himself had used the designation which he recommends already, (at least as would appear by the dates,) in Tract 63, *On the Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies.*

§ P. 410.



with which he regarded the system from which that memorable event separated us. But to effect this latter object fully would require a larger adduction of passages than we could afford. I may however give you two or three which seem to throw some additional light on his principles. As to saint and image-worship he says: 'I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping saints, and honouring the virgin, and images, &c. these things may perhaps be idolatrous; I cannot make up my mind about it.\*' I have already given a passage by which it would appear that he thought it also rash and unjustifiable to denounce their belief of transubstantiation as erroneous. And indeed he expressly says generally, 'Nor shall I even [ever?] abuse the Roman Catholics as a Church, for any thing except excommunicating us.† And, finally, having declared that the anathemas, as comprehending our deceased friends, must prevent every one from going over to Rome while she retains them, he gives more distinctly the reason which, as he avers, would for ever prevent him from joining the Church of Rome. 'I never could be a Romanist; I never could think *all those things in Pope Pius's Creed necessary to salvation.*'‡

\* P. 294.

† P. 395.

‡ Whether if a man who had at one time felt about *all those things in Pope Pius's Creed*, as it is to be supposed that every one who becomes a minister of the Church of England must have felt, were once brought to believe that they are true, he ought to feel it to be impossible that he should ever believe that they were also *necessary to salvation*,—the more especially when this step presented itself as essential to his communion with the Church, which held and professed all these most important doctrines, (for if they be true, their importance can hardly be doubted) which his own Church denied and renounced,—is a question which we need not attempt to settle. But it is important to remark how near Mr. Froude must have been to the former state of belief,—the belief, that is, that all the Articles of Pope Pius' Creed are true, if indeed he had not actually arrived at it. And this I think must be apparent, 1. Because the supposition that he believed them to be true, or, at the least, did not believe them to be false, seems the easiest mode of accounting for his emphatic declaration, that he never could believe them *necessary to salvation*. A clergyman of the Church of England, who could with truth declare that *he did not believe them to be true*, would have very obvious reasons for preferring such a mode of expressing his state of mind in reference to them, to the marked reserve of the profession that he could not be-

I have not given any examples of his mode of speaking of the Martyrs and Confessors, to whom, under God's blessing, we owe our deliverance from darkness and bondage. Because specimens of the tone in which he indulged in reference to them,—which is much coarser and more virulent than any respectable Roman Catholic writers employ on the same subject,—have been published in such a variety of shapes as to be familiar to every one. Such petulant, bitter, and irreverent sayings concerning those honoured servants of God and their great work, and the language of depreciation and contempt in which our Church, and her principles, and her services were spoken of in these volumes, and the admiration and affection with which Rome, notwithstanding some reserves, was undisguisedly regarded, produced a strong and extensive effect. Much of what was most objectionable in the volumes, had in substance appeared in the Tracts, and in other writings of their authors. But partly from the personal character of the man, and partly from the shape in which his sentiments appeared,—familiar letters, private journals, and notes of conversations—his tone was much more bold and unrestrained. So that some who had not been offended by the matter of the Tracts, were much offended and alarmed by the manner of Mr. Froude. And some whose eyes had been gradually opening to the tendencies of the movement, now saw them too distinctly to hesitate about the duty of separating them-

lieve them to be *necessary to salvation*. 2. He adds: 'But I do not see what harm an ordinary Romanist gets from thinking so,' i. e. thinking that they are necessary to salvation. Now when one considers what the doctrines are which are comprehended in the creed of Pope Pius, one can hardly suppose,—without ascribing to Mr. Froude the absolute latitudinarianism which cannot see that any thing that a man believes about anything, can do him harm,—that if he had believed them to be false, he would have expressed himself unable to see what harm it can do an ordinary Romanist to believe them true and necessary to salvation.

It would be inexcusable to spend time in this way in endeavouring to determine the exact state of belief of this individual, but for the double interest with which the times have invested it for us; first as illustrative of the hazard of dallying with Romanism; and, secondly, from the light which it also throws upon the principles of the party whose leaders have put him forward as their representative and champion.

selves from all connection with it. There was in consequence a considerable secession among the sounder portion of the admirers and supporters of the 'Tracts,' and probably some degree of jealousy and distrust infused into most of that class who continued to admire and support them. That there should be any such—any *loyal sons of the Reformation*,—any true members of the Church of England,—who remained attached to the party, after such an open declaration of their principles and feelings, may be regarded as strange and almost unaccountable. It is in fact only to be accounted for by what is hardly less strange, viz. that after all, they refused to receive this publication as a declaration of the principles of the authors of the 'Tracts.' It was well known that the real, though not the nominal, head of the party was the Editor of the work, with the aid of at least one of the two other members to whom the next place in influence is generally assigned. But notwithstanding this authentication of the publication as the act of the party, there were not a few of those to whom I have alluded, who could not be brought to regard them as responsible for the work, and who in consequence did not suffer it to shake their confidence in them. However blamable in point of prudence they regarded the Tractarians for publishing it, they obstinately refused to extend to them any portion of the more serious disapprobation which they most freely bestowed upon Mr. Froude and his writings. A general conformity of views and principles was of course admitted, but every thing violent, and dangerous, and absurd, in his opinions and sentiments, was regarded as his own.

The Editors most distinctly refused to be thus separated from him. They put forward as the object of the publication, and as its justification, *the truth and extreme importance of the views to which it was designed to be subservient*.<sup>\*</sup> To the promotion of those views they described their deceased friend as having devoted himself *ardently but soberly*.<sup>†</sup> A ground of censure would be found, they knew, in what would be called the intolerance of certain passages as regards Dissenters; they reply that *both this and the alleged tendency to Romanism are objections not to the present publication, but to the view which it is de-*

*signed to support*.<sup>\*</sup> They were aware that his sentences were in an unusual measure, *direct, fearless, and pungent*, and they apprehend that this may incline those who recoil from them to account them *speeches uttered at random, more for present point and effect, than to declare the speaker's real opinion*; and under that view of their nature, to disapprove of the publication of such sayings on such high and solemn subjects. And they at once secure such sentences from being set aside, and themselves from blame for publishing them, by denying the fact. *The expressions in question were not uttered at random, and cannot fairly be thrown by as mere chance sayings. . . . right or wrong, they were deliberate opinions, and cannot be left out of consideration, in a complete estimate of a writer's character and principles*.<sup>†</sup> Some of them, however well considered, may, in the way in which they are given, *appear unnecessarily startling and paradoxical*, and these at least, they knew, some would say, might have been left out. They state directly, among other reasons for inserting them, that *it was due to the reader to show him fairly how far the opinions recommended would carry him*. And while they declare on the one hand, that *nothing is kept back, but what it was judged would be fairly and naturally misunderstood*, they add on the other, that *they have not to the best of their judgment, inserted anything which did not tell, indirectly perhaps, but really, towards filling up that outline of his mind and character, which seemed requisite to complete the idea of him as a witness to Catholic views*.<sup>‡</sup>

They not unnaturally apprehend that it will be thought by many that he was an undutiful son, and an unfaithful minister of the Church to which he belonged; or, as they very distinctly state it,—*that, though a minister, he was not a sound and attached member of the English establishment: that he evaded its tests by a dry and literal interpretation of their wording, and availed himself of its influence and sustenance against itself*.

This is a serious charge. They say, *the answer to this objection is also simple*. I add that it is at the same time so instructive, so illustrative of the view which the party take of their obligations as ministers of the Anglican Church, and of the way and extent in which their re-

<sup>\*</sup> Preface, p. v.

<sup>†</sup> P. vii.

<sup>\*</sup> P. xvii. <sup>†</sup> Pp. xix. xx. <sup>‡</sup> Pp. xi. xxii.



lation to it is modified by their duties as ministers of the Church Catholic, that I shall give you the entire of it.

'The view which the author would take of his own position, was probably this: that he was a minister, not of any human establishment, but of the one Holy Church Catholic, which, among other places, is allowed by her Divine Master to manifest herself locally in England, and has, in former times, been endowed by the piety of her members: that the State has but secured by law those endowments which it could not seize without sacrilege, and in return for this supposed boon has encumbered the rightful possession of them by various conditions calculated to bring the Church into bondage: that her ministers, in consequence, are in no way bound to throw themselves into the Spirit of these enactments; rather are bound to keep themselves from the snare and guilt of them, and to observe only such a literal acquiescence as is all that the law requires in any case, all that an external oppressor has a right to ask. *Their* loyalty is already engaged to the Church Catholic, and they cannot enter into the drift and intentions of her oppressors, without betraying her. For example: they cannot do more than submit to the Statute of *Premunire*; they cannot defend or concur in the present suspension in every form of the Church's synodal powers, and of her powers of excommunication; nor can they sympathize in the provision which hinders their celebrating five out of the seven daily services, which are their patrimony, equally with Romanists. Again; doubtless, the spirit in which the present establishment was framed, would require an affectionate admiring remembrance of Luther and others, for whom there is no evidence that the author of these volumes ever entertained any reverence.' \*

The principle on which this defence rests, is plainly a very fruitful one. But its true range may be better learned from Mr Froude's application of it, than from the statement of his Editor, and the examples by which he chooses to illustrate it. It will be found that it reaches farther, not merely than the Editor intimates, but farther than we should ourselves probably have anticipated without such a practical exhibition of its working. The maxim indeed that a true churchman's allegiance is pre-engaged to the Church Catholic, as

it evidently substitutes his own or his party's views of the principles of the Church Catholic for all other authority, would prepare us for a good deal of insubordination in a "witness to Catholic views." And when we find that this maxim was combined with the theory, that the particular branch of the Church Catholic to which he belonged, is in bondage, and that the State is her oppressor, we might expect this insubordinate spirit to express itself from time to time in very intemperate and violent language, if restrained from more active manifestations. Were the State ever so truly the protector of the local Church, it could have no claim to be heard when it speaks in opposition to the Church Catholic; but being as it is, its oppressor, no true upholder of Catholic views can render any obedience to the enactments which maintain its tyranny, except by constraint and outwardly; or refrain from speaking of them with the indignation which they deserve. In a wholesome state of things, it is true, the branch of the Church to which we belong would have a fair claim to be regarded by us as the representative and interpreter of the Church universal. But in her bondage she could not herself desire that we should so regard her, lest we should haply take the language of her oppressor for her own. If she were free, she would doubtless always speak in harmony with Catholic views. If her unhappy circumstances ever force her to speak otherwise, we may be sure that we are not only acting in obedience to our highest duty, but that we are showing to *her* the reverence which is most acceptable to her, when we regard her as speaking by constraint; and obey instead, the voice to which she would have us always give ear. A child is not to be regarded as deficient in filial duty and tenderness because he does not yield obedience to every command of a parent who is beside herself. True duty and tenderness, on the contrary, will often enjoin disobedience, yea, it may be, force from him words that may sound harsh, and acts that may seem unkind.—When once this principle of the paramount duty of obedience to the Catholic Church had released a man from subjection to the authorities which God has set over him, talk of this kind, we know, would never be wanting to justify all that his own notions of Catholic views, or the notions of whatever little party, living or dead, he had chosen as the interpreter of the Catholic Church, might require him

\* Preface, p. xv.

to do or say. And so we might be prepared to see as the result of the principle, a great deal of self-will and presumption, under the guise of humility and submission. But it seems in Mr. Froude to lead to something more and worse. The tyranny of the State, and the weakness of the Church, seem to have divested them of all claims, not merely on his obedience, but also on his good faith. This is a very serious charge; but, as it seems clearly well founded, painful as it is, it is very necessary that it should be distinctly made; and being made, of course it ought to be substantiated.

For example: He declares as we have seen, that he was unable to make up his mind, whether *the worshipping of saints and honouring the Virgin and images as practised by Roman Catholics* is idolatrous or not.\* I have no disposition to inquire whether the declared views of our Church on this question forbid such indecision in her members. But he was a minister of the Church, and before he could become one he was obliged solemnly, and sincerely, in the presence of God, to profess, testify, and declare, that he did believe. . . . *that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint . . . as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.* And further, *solemnly, and in the presence of God to profess, testify, and declare, that he made this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto him, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever.* And he did all this. Now whatever justification his views of the Church and State might furnish for intemperate language, with reference to such a declaration,—for railing at the State for exacting, and the Church for submitting to, such a declaration,—what justification can they be supposed by honest minds to supply for his making it? And what justification can we imagine him to have found in his own mind for voluntarily making it, except this: that when the State tyrannically exacts declarations or engagements inconsistent with Catholic views, those who hold such views, whatever be the form of words which they are constrained to use, must be understood to use them with all such reservations as their allegiance to

the Catholic Church may render necessary?\*

Again: Mr. Froude's belief concerning the Eucharist was, that the power of *making the body and blood of Christ* is vested in the successors of the Apostles:† that in the exercise of the power bestowed upon them they perform a double miracle; one part being the making of the body and blood of Christ for our spiritual food,—and the other the preservation of the sensible bread and wine for the exercise of our faith:‡ that the canon of the Mass is the liturgy of St. Peter:§ that Pascal's statement—that the Lord fulfils His promise to the Apostles, of being with men always, by abiding under the species of the Eucharist, is an orthodox one:§ and that we cannot by any possibility know that it is true to say, that in the holy communion Christ is *not in our hands*. Now suppose that such views can be shown to allow a man, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, 'solemnly and in the presence of God, to profess, testify and declare, (as he did in the declaration already referred to, (that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper *there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the*

\* 'Ἡ γλαστὴ ἱμαμμεχ', ἡ δὲ φωνὴ ἀνύμωτος. If it be asked, Why come under these obligations at all? Why make declarations which are inconsistent with Catholic views? I can devise no answer, except that if this were not done, the ministry would be left to men of uncatholic or anti-catholic principles, and that it is plainly inconsistent with allegiance to the Catholic Church, to abandon the *local manifestation of it* with which we are connected to its enemies.

It may be said, that perhaps Mr. Froude took up the Catholic views which were inconsistent with these declarations, after he had become a minister of the Church. If this be the case it alters the view of his conduct, but does not amount to a defence of it. For undoubtedly whenever he took up views which were inconsistent with the profession of belief on which he was admitted to the ministry in the Church of England, the right mode of *keeping himself from the snare and guilt* of such obligations as he had come under, was not (as his Editor seems to represent) by railing at the obligations and the authorities which imposed them, but by publicly declaring his change of views, and by withdrawing from the trust which had been consigned to him, on the faith of his holding certain principles which he had ceased to hold.

† P. 326.

‡ Part II. Vol. I. p. 65.

§ Part I. Vol. I. p. 387.

§ P. 392.

\* See Appendix, Note C.



*consecration thereof by any person whatsoever,* how could they permit him to declare with the same solemnity that *the sacrifice of the mass as used by the Church of Rome is superstitious and idolatrous?* or willingly and *ex animo* to subscribe the twenty-eighth Article, (to particularize nothing else,) in which it is expressly declared that *the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith?*

Lastly, (not to continue this specification too far,) if there be any fundamental principle of our Church, it is *the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a Rule of Faith*; and if there be any of her principles explicitly declared in the Articles, it is this. To these Articles all her ministers subscribe 'willingly and *ex animo*.' But to take still further security that they agree with her in the fundamental principle, she requires all candidates for the order of priesthood, to declare that they are persuaded of its truth, and that they have determined by God's grace to regulate their ministry conformably. Now, notwithstanding all this, it appears that Mr. Froude did not believe this truth. But while he regarded so lightly his positive obligations to his own Church, he showed himself anxious to maintain his allegiance to the Catholic Church, so far as he understood her principles. And accordingly, though he reasons against this doctrine in various ways, he professes his readiness to believe it, if the Fathers taught it. And somebody having provided soon after what he regarded as a proof that the early Church did hold it, he discovers for the first time, and apparently with more surprise than satisfaction, that the Sixth Article of the Church admitted of a valid defence. It may be supposed therefore that somewhere about six years after he had made the subscription and declaration above referred to, he did believe this Article. But if he did, it was certainly but for a short time. In two months he relapsed into his former disbelief of it.\* And as this was within a very

short period of his death, it is unlikely that he changed again upon the point.

Now it is very plain that in whatever way the 'Catholic views' of which Mr. Froude is the chosen witness, dispensed with his belief in this fundamental principle of the Church, to which he was so solemnly pledged, they might enjoin and justify disbelief in any other. There is no other in fact on which the Church has more distinctly declared herself, and none upon which she has taken the same pains to secure the accordance of her ministers with her. This instance is therefore of peculiar importance in illustrating the practical working of 'Catholic views.' Indeed all the instances, which might easily be added to, give the same view of their operation. And it is to be remembered, that in all these instances, the practical application of "Catholic views," to the obligations under which the ministers of our Church lie, were made by one who is put forward as understanding them thoroughly, and acting uncompromisingly upon them. I will not attempt to speculate upon the effects of such views upon the sacredness of the engagements of private life; but it seems very plain, that they deprive the most solemn engagements, which those who hold them contract with the Church or with the State—at least with our enthralled Church and tyrannical State—of all force and value. It would seem from the examples just given, that there are no declarations which can be framed of belief in a doctrine—however explicit and unreserved they be, and however voluntarily they be made by one who holds what are called 'Catholic views'—which will give any absolute security that he believes the doctrine. His belief of it will, after all, be contingent upon his being able to make out for himself, or by the aid of some one else, that it was held by the Catholic Church. Indeed, when such declarations as those to which we have referred, have failed to secure their object, it must be plain that it is vain for our Church or State, to devise any others, in the hope of binding men of the principles of which Mr. Froude is made the witness and representative.

I shall now resume the history from

\* This is expressed in the following characteristic passage, which seems well conceived to intimate at the same time the respect in which he held the Articles of the Church;—'I have been thinking over and over again, N's argument from the Fathers, that Tradition in order to be authoritative must be in form interpretative, and can get no further than that it is

a convenient reason for tolerating the (I forget which) Article.' p. 423. Between 'for' and 'tolerating,' his Editor interposes [the Church's], but there appears no reason for the insertion, except that it softens the sentiment a little.

which this opportunity of throwing light upon the principles of *the movement*, has led us away. Nothing could be more distinct, as we have seen, than the warning to all its supporters, that in these volumes they had an authentic declaration of its objects and tendencies. But, there were not a few, as I have said, upon whom the warning was lost. They seemed resolved not to allow the authors of the Tracts to connect Mr. Froude's extravagances with their useful labours.—An indiscretion was, no doubt, committed in publishing a book, which contained so much that was calculated to alarm the timid, and indeed to give just offence to all sober-minded persons. It could not be too much lamented. But men are often led into such indiscretions by the partialities of friendship: and nothing more than the allowances which are generally made upon such occasions was needed, to shield Mr. Froude's friends from the imputation of anything beyond a general community of sentiment with that very rash and intemperate young man.—Such was the language which was constantly heard from some who strongly disapproved of this publication, and who thus extended to those who had given it to the world a kind of protection which they seemed determined to repudiate. In a year after the publication of the selection from Mr. Froude's Remains, which excited so much discussion, another selection of about equal extent appeared, by the same editors, in the Introduction to which, they very decidedly decline this interposition of their friends, though not unaware of the risk that they were thereby running of offending and alienating them. In thus persisting in the step which had given such offence, they represent themselves as 'not wilfully slighting any man's scruples or remonstrances, but still thinking that the cause of the Church, which is paramount to everything, leaves them not at liberty, either to withdraw any important portion of what has been made public, or to suppress what remains.'\* And they proceed to review everything in the former part which startled and offended so many, and to vindicate all—all that was said of the Reformation and of the Reformers, and of the Established Church, and of her Liturgy—upon the Catholic principles which the Tracts were intended to teach and to maintain: so as to convey very

distinctly that those who professed to make a distinction between the views and principles of the authors of the Tracts, and those of Mr. Froude,—to approve of the former, while they condemned the latter,—apprehended but imperfectly what they admired. For it appeared that the true and only difference between him and the other members of his party, was, that he saw sooner, and still more, that he followed out more boldly, the real consequences of the principles, which both he and they held. And they add, that every day was bearing testimony to the correctness of his anticipations; and the more closely that what was felt to be bold, or harsh, or eccentric in his sentiments, was examined, the more would it be found to be the result of a fair and uncompromising application of Catholic principles to the circumstances with which he had to deal,—only what we might expect to discover when 'the great principle of Catholicism, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, had once rooted itself in the mind of a person thus determined not to flinch from results;' 'in a true, courageous, and consistent follower of the ancients,' in a mind 'thoroughly uncompromising in its Catholicity.'\*

One of the evidences of this author's sagacity, which is dwelt upon in the Preface, is the way in which events were bringing about an unlooked-for conformity with, or, at least, tolerance of, his strongest opinions, 'so that (they say) *already* many things, which sounded paradoxical and over bold when he first uttered them, *may be ventured on* with hope of a reasonable degree of acceptance.† His slower, or more prudent brethren, were certainly taking full advantage of this change, which, though they make no boast of it, they had done so much to bring about. Of the Tracts published at this time, the only one which I can find time to mention here, is 'On the indications of a superintending Providence in the preservation of the prayer-book, and in the changes which it has undergone.‡' The object of this Tract is to show, that, having been reduced at the Reformation to 'a low and decayed state,' 'shorn and left bare of much that is valuable, and in a degraded condition,'—in a state of servitude,—the providence

\* Preface to Part II. Vol. I. p. iv.

\* Preface, pp. xi. xiii. xv.

† P. vii.

‡ No. LXXXVI. For some of the other Tracts of this period, see note D.



of God has been exercised in adapting our ritual to our position, and that it is hence that it is characterized by a tone of sadness and humiliation, by 'the language of those who have fallen away from the richer inheritance and the privileges of sons.' And so we have dropped the words and the observances which belonged to a higher state. For example, to pray for the dead who are in a state of comparative blessedness, is 'the privilege of saints rather than the office of servants.' We omit such prayers, 'as disunited from the pure communion of those departed saints who are now with Christ, as if scarce worthy to profess ourselves one of them.' 'Again: we omit anointing at Baptism and Confirmation. And when we consider how likely this is to have been a Divine institution, (for whatever custom is primitive, is almost certainly Apostolical, and it can hardly be supposed that the Apostles would have invented anything of a sacramental nature of themselves,) and likewise its typical use applied to prophets, priests, and kings,' 'surely no one can say the greatness of the gifts here withdrawn; how much we have thereby fallen from the high appellations of "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people."' I add but one more instance out of a great number as very remarkable. 'In speaking of the rubric, the substitution of the term, *'table,' 'holy table,'* and in the Scotch, of *'God's board,'* for that of *'altar,'* (which is in Edward's first book as well as *'God's board,'*) is a strong instance of this our judicial humiliation. For what is it but to say, that the higher mysteries which this word *'altar'* represents are,—not taken away from us (*μὴ γένοιτο*)—but partially withdrawn from view; and doubtless therefore lost to many who consider not the Lord's body.\*

A great deal more might be given in the same strain. But this is enough, to show how steadily the design was fol-

lowed up, of disparaging the Church, and lowering it in the eyes of its members.

All this while the controversy was carried on with increasing activity. And, though it brought out, in some quarters, partial apologies and qualifications, in others it served to educe still clearer and stronger declarations of the views of the School. There were other demonstrations of the same kind, which were, it may be supposed, forced out by the ardour of some younger followers, who pressed for the consequences of principles before the time. And writers on the opposite side had been gradually bringing before almost all readers a great deal of what the Tracts and other publications, in endless variety, had been doing to unsettle the principles of the members of our Church, to disparage and depreciate the advantages of her communion, detach the affections and respect of her members from her, and transfer them to a vague and shifting notion of the Church Catholic,—which was sure, with most minds, to find its permanent representation in the Romish Church before their eyes.

While many thinking and honest minds were vainly perplexed with the question, how men who entertained such principles and feelings, and who so laboured to propagate them, could remain ministers of the Church of England, a startling solution of the difficulty appeared in a Tract for the Times, which in some respects went beyond all that had gone before it. It was professedly a proof, that though the Articles were the offspring of an uncatholic age, and conceived in a Protestant tone, they yet admitted a Catholic interpretation, and might consequently be signed by those who held 'Catholic views.' This was the professed object of the Tract. What the practical meaning of "Catholic views," as professed and maintained by the school to which the author belonged, was, ought to have ceased to be matter of doubt long before this publication. In fact, from the time that in their vocabulary *Protestant* became synonymous with *Anti-Catholic*, it ought to have been very clear, that *Catholic* could not very materially differ from *Roman*. But if any doubt had rested upon this point, the way in which the writer of this Tract chooses to prove that the Articles may be subscribed by men of "Catholic views," was well fitted to take it away:

\* Now I suppose, to say no more, if what the author had to account for were the substitution of *Altar* for *Table*, or for *God's board*, every one sees how much easier it would be for him to find in the change, *a strong instance of our judicial humiliation*,—and that we should have heard of our ceasing to be sons,—renouncing the filial privilege of coming to the table of our father,—not venturing to appropriate to ourselves any longer the blessedness of those to whom Christ condescends to promise that *he will come in and sup with them, and they with him*;—and a great deal to the same purpose.

for the mode of proof which is adopted for the most part is, by showing that there is, in fact, no irreconcilable opposition between the Thirty-nine Articles, and the leading principles of the Church of Rome, as promulgated in the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent ! This, in itself, would be enough to give any one acquainted in any measure with the true state of the case, some conception of the character of the publication. Nothing better, in fact, as all such persons must well know, than sophistry and evasion, could be brought in support of such a thesis. And certainly both are employed in the Tract, in as ample measure as any one could be disposed to anticipate.

Not to advert to any of the less direct difficulties which are thrown in the way of such an undertaking by those Articles, of which the bearing on the principles of the Church of Rome, might be matter of argument and inference,—some of them seem to offer an insurmountable obstacle to the attempt, by denouncing explicitly the *Romish doctrine* upon certain important points. The mode taken with respect to such cases is to distinguish between the doctrine condemned as Romish in the Articles, and that which was established as Romish by the Tridentine Decrees. And the writer lays down as the groundwork of the distinction, that the Articles cannot have been directed against those Decrees, for they were written before the Decrees. Waiving the inquiry, how far this is true in point of fact,\* it would not seem to be of much importance to the question. For even if the Articles do not refer to the Decrees, yet if both refer to the same thing,—if the former are intended to condemn what the latter were intended to establish, it would seem enough. And that this, at least, is the case, would not appear to admit of any reasonable doubt. For first, when it is considered who were the framers of our Articles, it must be seen, that if there were a doctrine of the Romish Church, at the time, upon any of the points treated of by the Convocation, it cannot be supposed to have been otherwise than perfectly known to them. So that what they condemn, under the name of the Romish Doctrine, was undoubtedly the doctrine of the Church of Rome. And on the other hand, it would seem to be just as little to be doubted,

that the purpose and the effect of the Decrees of the Council, were not to alter the doctrine of the Church, but to establish it.

It would seem that neither of these points could fairly be disputed. In the Tract, however, without openly disputing them, doubts are thrown upon both. And before I consider what is said for that purpose, I may remind you, that even if it were successful, still there is another way of establishing the opposition between the Articles and the Decrees, which seems open to no doubt. No one who is acquainted with the Tridentine Canons and Decrees, can doubt that *they* are directed against the *Protestant Doctrine*, upon the various controverted points on which they treat. If ever they leave it doubtful what it is which they mean to establish, as the doctrine of the Church of Rome, they take all due pains to make it very clear what is the doctrine which they mean to oppose and overthrow. They state distinctly, (however very often unfairly,) the various points in which the Protestant doctrine is opposed to the doctrine of Rome, and they distinctly condemn and anathematize it in every particular. And though sometimes this doctrine is disfigured in their enunciations of it, it retains enough of its substance, and of its shape, too, to identify it, beyond any doubt, with the Protestant doctrine which our Articles are intended to set forth. So that here is the opposition between the Articles and the Decrees unquestionably established. It is therefore not as a matter of necessity, but as a matter of interest, and as further exhibiting the character of this extraordinary Tract, that I give you the trouble of considering the attempt which it makes to throw doubts upon the fact, that what the Articles condemn as Romish doctrine, is the very doctrine which the Decrees were intended to establish.

It is not denied, that when the Reformers in the Articles condemned the Romish doctrine, they perfectly knew what the doctrine of the Church of Rome was ; nor, on the other hand, is it expressly asserted, that the Council of Trent did not intend to establish that doctrine. But both points are dealt with in this way. It is laid down, on the one hand, that ‘ what is opposed [in the Articles] is the *received doctrine* of the day, and unhappily of this day, too, or the doctrine of the *Romish schools*.’ And it is asserted or acknowledged,

\* See Note D 2. Appendix.



that this doctrine of the Romish schools is rightly considered 'the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome.' But in discussing details, it is attempted to be shown, that what the Articles have in view, is some of the grosser errors of the popular creed, or the more flagrant abuses of the popular practice. And it is maintained, on the other hand, that the errors of the scholastic doctrine are not established by the Decrees, and that the abuses of the popular practice are at times condemned and discountenanced by them, so that the Articles 'gain a witness and concurrence from the Council of Trent.'

Now, that there was any thing which could bear the name of the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, at the time of the Council of Trent, which was not established by its Decrees, was a very new view of the effects of the Council, both to Protestants and Roman Catholics. No one, it is true, could read the Decrees without seeing that they were very artfully framed to avoid an open patronage of whatever had brought most scandal upon the Church; but, then, it seemed equally apparent that they were framed with a full determination to retain the substance of the errors in principle, which were the root and spring of all that was offensive in her practice. Hitherto few seemed to doubt that they had fully succeeded. And by none had this view of the effect of the Council been expressed more decidedly, or more strongly, than by the authors of the Tracts; so that it would be hard to produce from any other source more explicit and pointed contradictions of this novel representation of the Tridentine Decrees.\*

\* A number of extracts from the Tracts, and from the other writings of their chief authors, are appended to Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, with a view of clearing the party of the imputation of a leaning to Rome. Amongst these passages, are several from Mr. Newman's works, one of which is as follows. 'The Council of Trent did, as regards Roman errors, what, for all we know, though God forbid, some future synod of the English Church may do, as regards Protestant errors, take them into her system, make them forms of communion, bind upon her hitherto-favoured sons their grievous chain. And what that unhappy council did for Rome, that does every one in his place, and according to his power, who by declaiming against, and denouncing those who dare to treat the Protestant errors as unestablished, gives a helping hand to their establishment.'—*Newman's Letter to Faussett*, p. 15. And again, 'Why are the Tracts to be

Their special charge, indeed, against the Council of Trent, had been, that it fixed upon the Church as its unalterable doctrine, what, up to the time, only existed in such a shape as would allow of its being got rid of. It was the discovering that this was the effect of what he styles 'the atrocious council,' which, Mr. Froude says, changed altogether his notions of the Roman Catholics, and made him wish for the total overthrow of their system.\* And, in the Tracts, the same view meets us in various shapes. It is stated, that the Council of Trent converted certain theological opinions into (what they maintained to be) Catholic verities.† And the body of the Romish Church is described as having become uncatholic by the act. Indeed, it is asserted in an earlier Tract, that Rome then first became *an heretical Church*; and, it is added, 'If she has apostatized, it was at the time of the Council of Trent. Then, if at any time, surely not before, did the Roman communion bind itself in covenant to the cause of Antichrist.'‡

This may be enough to say, in answer to this attempt to distinguish between the Romish doctrine, as established by the decrees of the Council of Trent, and 'the authoritative teaching' of the Church of Rome at the time. But,—perhaps in some distrust of the soundness of the distinction,—more pains are expended upon the other head, viz. that upon the various points on which the Articles condemn 'the Romish doctrine' in the name, it is, in fact, the grosser errors of the popular creed, or the presumptuous subtleties of the teaching of the schools, which they have in view, and not the substance of the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Of the nature and amount of the sophistry expended upon this point, nothing like an adequate conception could be given, without such a detailed review, as it would be impossible for us now to enter upon. In fact, throughout the whole Tract, but more especially upon this point, the dishonest casuistry to which the Jesuits have given a name, is employed upon a scale to which it would be hard to find a parallel, except in the more notorious of their

censured for stating a plain historical fact, that the Roman Church did not, till Trent, embody in her Creed, the mass of her present tenets, while they do not deny, but expressly acknowledge her great corruptions before that era.'—*Ibid.* p. 18.

\* Vol. I. p. 308.

† No. LXI. p. 3.

‡ No. XV. p. 10.

own writings. One of the society, indeed, Gregory de Valentia, seems to supply the *type* of the whole argument on this head, when he infers, that as St. Peter speaks of *abominable idolatries*, there must be some idolatries under the Gospel which are not *abominable*.\* The Articles furnish the author of the tract with but slender materials for this kind of logic. But their deficiencies are supplied by resorting to the Homilies, to determine their sense. As might be expected from the purpose of those discourses, and the time and circumstances under which they were written, they contain not a few passages in which the grosser forms in which Romish errors and superstitions manifested themselves, are dwelt upon and exposed. Such passages were evidently intended to exhibit the erroneous principles of the Church of Rome in a stage of development, which was at once fitted to show their true nature, to the many who might not discern it under a less flagrant manifestation of it, and to deepen and quicken the dread and hatred of those false principles in the minds of others, who might not stand in the same need of aids to apprehension; to bring distinctly before the minds of all the members of the Church, what the practical evils of the system had been from which the Reformation had delivered them. But they are not brought forward in the Tract as if such was their purpose, but as if they were to be taken as strict designations of those parts of the Romish system which it was intended to condemn. And forthwith it is inferred, that it is only these forms and degrees of the false doctrine, or the superstitious practice which the Church in the Homily, and therefore in the Article, intends to denounce. And so every degree short of that which figures in these descriptions, and every doctrine and practice akin to those described, but not formally comprehended under these illustrations, are held to be outside the denunciations of the Articles, so that their truth and falsehood, lawfulness or unlawfulness, are open questions among those who have subscribed the Articles. Such unfairness appears hardly

to admit of aggravation. But yet it must be felt to be not a little aggravated by the fact, that there are passages in the Homilies,—sometimes in the very Homily from which these quotations are made,—sometimes even in direct connexion with the passages quoted,—which plainly testify that the Church was opposed to the Romish doctrine on the points referred to, in every degree and under every form, and not merely in those extreme degrees and those grosser forms, which, for obvious reasons, it takes most pains to present in full detail.\*

But I should, as I said, despair of conveying any thing like a full impression of the shifting, evasive, and disingenuous sophistry, with which the purpose of the Tract is followed out, except by an actual review in detail of the mode of treating some of the heads. And for this we have no time. I must satisfy myself, therefore, with this general account of this celebrated publication, and return to the history which it has interrupted. It seemed as if some mistake had been committed in supposing the public mind ripe for so open a demonstration. For this attempt to show how unavailing were the barriers against Romanism, which the Reformers had reared, and in which their posterity had hitherto confined, seemed everywhere to excite painful and indignant surprise. Any one who had reflected upon what these authors had been saying upon almost every point which divides us from the Church of Rome, must have seen that some such process as that which is given in the Tract, must have been gone through, in order to reconcile them to remaining where they were. But few had so reflected. And even those who had, were startled (as often happens) when they saw the process exhibited nakedly, and in detail, which they had thought over in a general way, it might be, with but feeble sentiments of disgust and alarm.

It was impossible in the first place for any thinking person to see, without much alarm, the advance in their progress towards Rome, which the party had made in a comparatively short period. How far this was to be set down to a rapid development of their principles, and how far to a more open disclosure of them, it was not easy to determine. For, besides other evidences of a politic concealment of their opinions and

\* Quoted by Bishop Hall. 'How must he, [that is well grounded in the doctrine of the Second Commandment,] needs bless himself at the strange collection of a Valentia, because St. Peter cries out of *abominable idolatries*, that therefore there are some idolatries under the gospel which are not abominable.'—*The Peacemaker*. Sect. II.

\* See Note E.



feelings, we find the writer of this Tract complaining of having been forced to a premature disclosure of them on one point by circumstances in his position in Oxford, which were often, he intimates, interfering with the reserve concerning them which it might be prudent to adopt.\* But whichever it were, development or disclosure, the *visible* advance which the movement had made towards Rome in a very short period, was enough to amaze and terrify those who saw no cause of alarm in the first steps in the same path. One example of this, which is so important a fact with reference to the *movement*, I shall give, as it may be given in a very few words. Mr. Froude's Remains, as I have before mentioned, offended all who were outside the party, and many who, up to the publication of them, had been regarded as belonging to it; and in nothing more than by the undisguised admiration with which he regarded much in the Romish system which Protestants in general had been taught to view in a very different light. He seems very earnestly to have desired a reunion with Rome, but to have felt in the Council of Trent there was an insurmountable obstacle to the accomplishment of his wishes. We have seen, in consequence, in what terms he spoke of the Council. It appears indeed that, when at Rome, he consulted an eminent Ecclesiastic upon the terms on which the English Church (or a portion of it) would be received back again; and that, upon finding that the Council must be taken *whole*, by any who would return to the Church of Rome, he was driven to despair of the event, feeling the condition to be impossible. And he declares there-

upon his resolution to abandon reunion with Rome, as the object to be agitated for by his party, and to substitute in its stead, a return to the principles of the Nonjurors, under the name of "The Ancient Church of England." And the strength of his feeling upon this point was further evinced by a saying, which is recorded in his Remains, and which was circulated very extensively, together with other extracts of an Anti-Romish character from the publications of the school, when the object was to clear them from the charge of a leaning to Popery. Upon one saying that the Romanists were schismatics in England, but Catholics abroad, he replied, *No, they are wretched Tridentines every where.* And yet in the few years which had elapsed, what had appeared to his sanguine and not over-scrupulous mind an insurmountable obstacle, seemed to have been almost, if not altogether, cleared away. The detestation with which the Council was regarded had disappeared, and the impediments to reunion with Rome no longer lay in its immutable canons and decrees, but in the popular belief and in the teaching of the schools; which so many of these writers held to be a bad reason for separating from her at the first, and which they were so little likely long to regard (if they still regarded it) as a sufficient ground for keeping up the separation. But be that as it might, so far as the Tridentine Decrees and the Thirty-nine Articles were concerned, there was no impediment to a reconciliation—it was only to master thoroughly, and employ boldly, the scheme of interpretation provided in the Tract, and the supposed opposition between them would disappear.\*

\* "And perhaps I may be permitted to add, that our difficulties are much increased in a place like this, when there are a number of persons of practised intellects, who, with or without unfriendly motives, are ever drawing out the ultimate conclusions in which our principles result, and forcing us to affirm or deny what we would fain not consider or pronounce upon. . . . Accordingly I left, for instance, the portion which treated of the invocation of saints, without any definite conclusion at all, after bringing together various passages in illustration. However, friends and opponents discovered that my premises required,—what I was very unwilling to state categorically, for various reasons,—that the *ora pro nobis* was not on my shewing necessarily included in the invocation of saints which the Article condemns."—*Newman's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, p. 18.

\* The substance of a letter from the Rev. G. Spencer to the Editor of the *Univers*, on the Catholic movement in England, has been circulated a good deal in this country. As there seems no reason to doubt its genuineness, the portion of it which bears upon this point seems worth extracting here. "They constantly maintain that though the Thirty-nine Articles, which are the confession of faith of the Anglican Church, were the work of men, like Crammer, infected with heresy, yet that God did not permit that there should be inserted into them any declarations absolutely contrary to the Catholic faith. They prove by facts drawn from the history of their church, that, ever since the pretended Reformation, this church has ever had within her bosom, and in an uninterrupted succession, Doctors, Priests, and Bishops, who have signed the aforesaid Articles in a sense altogether Catholic; still further they openly avow, that they

Such an advance as this, made any further advance credible;\* and the pro-

cess by which it was justified, made any further advance easy.\* And both not

themselves have no objection to urge against the decisions of the Council of Trent, *that it is in the sense of the Catholic faith as agreed upon at that Council*, that they profess to understand the formularies of their own church. Lastly, as a proof that the spirit of the Anglican Church is essentially Catholic, and that its formularies cannot be regarded as implying a formal condemnation of Catholic doctrines, they point to this significant fact, viz. that since they have openly proclaimed these sentiments to the world, nobody has been able to offer them any effectual opposition. At first there was an outcry against them, but latterly they have been allowed to go on pretty much as they liked.

Another letter addressed to the Editor of the *Univers*, professing to be written by 'a young member of the University of Oxford,' and dated, 'Oxford, Passion Sunday, 1841,' was reprinted in the *Catholic Magazine* for May in the same year, in which it is said that 'the Editor of the *Univers* vouches for its authenticity. It furnishes the following extract upon the same point. 'Mr. Newman, one of our theologians, published a few days since, the 90th Number of the 'Tracts for the Times,' in which he designs to demonstrate that the Church of Rome has fallen into no formal error in the Council of Trent, that the invocations of the saints, (the *ora pro nobis* for example) purgatory, and the supremacy of the Holy See of Rome, are in no way contrary to the Catholic traditions, or even to our authorized formularies; in fine, that the dogma of transubstantiation should be no obstacle to the union of churches, as in this article there is only a verbal difference between them. At the same time, that he is but little satisfied with our Thirty-nine Articles, although he maintains throughout that the providence of God hindered the Reformers from openly inserting in them the Protestant dogmas to which they were but too much attached. You will perceive, Sir, all the importance of those opinions, and the more so, as they are not the opinions of an isolated theologian. I can assure you, that at the same time that an opposition was raised by the elder members of the university, (as might be expected, seeing that they lived under the light of the eighteenth century,) that very opposition gave me an opportunity of observing, that even the most moderate of the Catholic party at Oxford were ready to sustain the author of the Tracts.'

\* It was referred to at the time by Dr. Wiseman, in a Letter to the author of Tract No. XC. And the remarkable change which his views upon this point had undergone, was gravely, but pointedly pressed upon him, as a motive to forbearance in the use of severe language concerning those portions of the Romish system which he had not yet adopted, but to the truth and holiness of which, as past experience ought to teach him, his eyes might be so opened as to make him bitterly regret

his present asperities towards them. The fairness and propriety of this 'charitable warning,' were sufficiently vindicated by the past; but they have been further curiously justified, since these pages went to press, by an explicit retraction from the author of the Tract, of all the strong and hard things which he had published for the last eight years against Rome, whether with or without his name; the strength and severity of which were so often referred to in that eventful time, as proving that the Anti-Protestantism of the writer and his party was not Romanism. This palinode was given to the public in a letter to the Editor of the *Conservative Journal* in February last. It was for some unexplained reason, published without any signature; but there can be no doubt whose it is, as in the body of it the writer refers to a work published with the name of the author of the 90th Tract, and treats it as his own. He accounts for his having *ventured* to use the language which he employed in speaking against the Church of Rome, in the following remarkable passage: "If you ask me how an individual could venture, not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a communion so ancient, so wide-spreading, so fruitful in saints, I answer, that I said to myself, 'I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views too are necessary to our position.' Yet I have reason to fear that such language is to be ascribed, in no small measure, to an impetuous temper, a hope of approving myself to persons' respect, and a wish to repel the charge of Romanism."

\* That the meaning proposed to be assigned to the Articles is not that which those who framed them intended them to bear, is not denied. And on the other hand it cannot be pretended that the sense proposed to be put on the Tridentine Decrees is that which their framers intended to express. Indeed the author in his explanatory letter to Dr. Jelf, says: 'Those decrees *expressed* her [Rome's] authoritative teaching, and they will still continue to express it, while she so teaches. The simple question is, whether *taken by themselves in the mere letter*, they express it; whether, in fact, other senses, short of the sense conveyed in the present authoritative teaching of the Romish Church will not fulfil *their letter*, and may not now even in point of fact be held in that Church.' P. 4. So far as the Tract itself was concerned, it might be doubtful whether the new scheme of interpretation, which it provides, was intended to show those who hold the substance of the Articles, that they may assent to the letter of the Decrees; or those who hold the substance of the Decrees, that they may subscribe to the letter of the Articles. From the circumstances we presume



unnaturally excited very general alarm and indignation. But with whatever measure of such feelings the publication was received, while it was regarded as a defence of the author, and those who felt with him, for continuing ministers of the Church of England, they fell far short of those which it raised, when it was known what its true object was. It was distinctly stated by the author of the Tract himself, in an apologetic letter which he was led to publish, in the beginning of the pamphlet war to which it gave rise, that it was written at the earnest instance of some whom he revered, who urged him *to do all that he could to keep members of our Church from straggling in the direction of Rome.* He does not expressly say who they were who were in danger of thus falling away, but little doubt could be entertained that they were principally the younger members of the University, and those who had lately left its walls; whose attachment to their own Church had been shaken by the unwearied labours of the writer and his colleagues. That such views were entertained by those who possessed such means of extending them, and who used them all so actively and perseveringly, was indeed alarming. And no honest mind could learn without surprise and indignation, that these men were not merely professed members, but ministers of our own Church. But their actual success in propagating their principles in such a quarter, was still more startling tidings to the many who heard them for the first time. It could not but fill every sound mind with still livelier indignation, and still more anxious apprehensions, to learn, that young men, confided to the University to be trained in the principle of the Church, had been taught so different a lesson; that their warm and susceptible minds had been so acted upon, that instead of being confirmed in the feelings of reverence and attachment to their own Church with which they had begun their course, they now needed the sophistry of this Tract to keep them within its pale. But it was still worse to know that they were capable of making use of it. I repeat deliberately, that distressing and alarming as it was to find, that a portion of the flower and hope of the coun-

try had had their Protestant principles so shaken by those who should have established them, that they stood in actual need themselves of this singular Preservative from Popery; it was still more distressing and alarming to learn, that their honesty had been so tainted in the process, that they were capable of employing it,—that one who must have been supposed to have known intimately the minds on which he had exercised so baleful an influence, should have been able to calculate on their readiness to avail themselves of such a mode of escape from the fair force of the most solemn and sacred obligations, by such sophistry and evasion, such shifts and contrivances as a man could not apply to the very lightest of the engagements of common life, without forfeiting all reputation for integrity and good faith.

Soon after, the Board of the Heads of Houses, the Executive authority of Oxford, in vindication of the character of the University, and to impede the further propagation of such principles among its members, visited the Tract with their solemn censure. The grave and well-considered document in which it was conveyed, after referring first to the statutes of the University, in which it is enjoined, that every student shall be instructed in the Thirty-nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them, disclaims on behalf of the University all sanction of the Series of Tracts with which its name had been associated; and then proceeds to pronounce the following measured, but severe sentence, upon the particular number which had attracted so much attention:

‘RESOLVED, That modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading, rather than explaining, the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the objects, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned STATUTES.’

I shall not attempt to advert in any way to the various pamphlets to which this celebrated publication gave rise, except to say, that they included very strenuous defences of its principles from every person of note who had contributed to the series. Here, then, at last was something which must be received, one would say, as evidence, not less authentic than it was unequivocal, of the Rome-

that the latter was the real object. But indeed it is evidently equally capable of being employed to enable a man who believes neither, to assent to both.

ward tendencies of the principles of the authors of the Tracts for the Times. It was, itself, a Tract for the Times. It was written by one who was esteemed the real head of the Tractarian party, though the popular voice had assigned that place to another. But however that might be, that other, and every other member of the party of any name, had come forward to avow and defend the general principles of the Tract, though not subscribing to every particular position in it.

The Tract is of very great importance, in this point of view, as an authentic declaration of the principles of this formidable party; and perhaps of no less in another, that is, as an authentic defence of the principles of the authors of the Tracts for the Times, (considered as ministers of the Church of England,) devised by one of these authors, inferior to none in ingenuity, and countersigned by the most eminent of his colleagues:—which may, therefore, be fairly taken as the best attempt that can be devised to reconcile their principles to the obligations under which they lie by subscription to the Articles of the Church. And accordingly I believe that it was conclusive with many, who had held out against all other proofs of the principles and objects of the party.

At the recommendation of the Bishop of the Diocese, the series of Tracts for the Times terminated with this Number. But the movement, as might have been predicted, has gone on at an accelerated rate. The party have long possessed a most formidable, and indeed astonishing, command of the press, and speak through a great variety of organs. The one which furnishes, perhaps, the fullest and clearest evidence of their steady advance, is the *British Critic*; the length of its articles admitting of a more detailed and orderly exhibition of the views of the school than is compatible with the character of the less deliberate publications, magazines, and newspapers, through which their principles are most industriously disseminated. I shall give, from its pages, a few specimens of the recent and actual tone of the party.

The contemptuous and bitter passages in which the Reformation, and the Reformed Church are spoken of, were very generally felt to be a very offensive part of Tract 90.\* But subsequent publica-

tions have gone far beyond it, not indeed in bitterness of tone, but in distinctness of statement. The Reformation is described not merely as a *desperate remedy*, for the diseases of the Church at the time, but as a *fearful judgment* upon her;\* as a *deplorable schism*.† Of Protestantism generally, they say that it is *in its essence, and in all its bearings, characteristically the religion of corrupt human nature*. And as to the English Reformation, in particular, they profess their agreement with the editors of Mr. Froude's Remains, in the sentiment, 'that the lines respectively of Catholic Antiquity, and of the English Reformation, (except so far as the genius of the latter has been overruled, by influences extrinsic to the opinions and wishes of its promoters,) *are not only diverging but opposed*.' They deny to those who laid down their lives in the attempt to reform the Church of England, the title of "Martyrs;" on the ground that they would be admitting, if they gave them the name, that they died for "the Truth," which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can allow.‡ And they

\* *British Critic*, No. LIX., p. 2. The writer gives this character of the Reformation, with the kind of qualification which does not intimate the least doubt of the truth of what one is saying, but merely a passing suspicion of its prudence. 'What a warning to all after ages, to keep sentinel against the earliest inroads of corruption and misrule, to reflect that, once upon a time, and no very long time ago, the Church suffered the seeds of fatal disease to take such deep root in her existing constitution, as to entail upon herself the necessity of a remedy so desperate, we had almost said, the penalty of a judgment so fearful, as the Reformation!' The writer goes on to profess, that he esteems it 'when viewed in its leading principles, rather than its incidental effects, and in its common features, rather than its local peculiarities, as involving, in its circumstances, far too much evil, to be a legitimate subject of triumph; as a blessing, in fact, to the Church, *mainly in that it was a visitation upon neglect, and so is a call to repentance*.'

† *British Critic*, No. LIX., p. 2.

‡ 'Well; what we say is, that to call the earlier Reformers martyrs, is to beg the question, which of course Protestants do not consider a question; but which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can for a moment think of conceding to them, viz., whether that for which those persons suffered, were "the truth?"'—*British Critic*, No. LIX., p. 14. This is, among other things, worthy of remark, as an advance on Mr. Froude. He said of one of these honoured sufferers, (and

\* See Appendix, Note F.



propose the following, as a very perplexing practical question: 'How persons cordially believing that *the Protestant tone of doctrine and thought is essentially Anti-Christian* (a class we can assure our readers, by no means inconsiderable,) can conscientiously adhere to a communion which has been made such as it is, in contradistinction from other portions of the Catholic Church, chiefly through the instrumentality of persons *disavowing the judgment of Rome*, not merely in this or that particular, but in its general view of Christian truth?'"\*

As to the doctrine of *Justification by Faith only*, they generally choose to assail it under the name of "the Lutheran doctrine of Justification," or "this modern theology," or some such title, under which they may attack it with somewhat less indecency than if it were expressed in the common form of words, which our Church employs, when she pronounces it to be 'a wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.' But

quite bad enough it was thought at the time, but "not being the worst, stands in some rank of praise."—"One must not speak lightly of a martyr, so I do not allow my opinions to pass the verge of scepticism. But I really do feel sceptical whether Latimer was not something in the Bulteel line," &c.—Vol 1, p. 252.

\* *British Critic*, No. LIX., p. 29. The solution of this difficulty, which was proposed by the editors of Mr. Froude's Remains, is, that the Church of England is not in any degree pledged to the opinions of the Reformers, but is what she is, not as the result of their principles, but of those principles providentially overruled by various influences. And that thus while, 'as a mark of decay and deserved anger, our Church seems to have been left an inadequate image of antiquity; as a token to encourage hope, and penitence, and labour, it was not, however, an untrue image.' (*Froude's Remains*, Part II., Preface xxiii.) In the Article on Jewel, from which I have already quoted so much, it is said, 'Mr. Froude's editors have thrown out a rope, which, whether trust-worthy or not, is at all events the only conceivable means of escape for persons in a very embarrassing position; and for this act of kindness they deserve our thanks, however, we may pause, as is very natural, and even prudent, before availing ourselves of the proffered aid.' Besides other advantages of this view, 'if it will but hold,' they notice this important one; 'Here is a view which promises the power of upholding Pope Hildebrand and the see of St. Peter, for all the Reformers denied the supremacy of the Church; and of ministering in copes, for all they thought even surplices of the essence of Antichrist.'—*British Critic*, No. LIX., p. 31.

their hostility to it is unmitigated and unbounded, and, indeed, seems to find no adequate expression short of the most rabid violence of language. As, for example, 'To speak as if this latter scheme of doctrine were, in itself, otherwise than radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical, and Anti-Christian, shows but an inadequate grasp of its antagonist truth:'\* meaning, it is to be presumed, what they speak of as 'the great doctrine of Justification by Works.' But we are spared the trouble of attempting to collect the proofs of their hostility to it, which are scattered through their writings, by the following passage, which explicitly declares their rooted enmity to it, and their just sense of the importance of its overthrow to the success of their labours;† 'The very first aggression, then, of those who labour to revive some degree, at least, of vital Christianity, (in the room of those gross corruptions and superstitions, which have in these latter days among ourselves, overlaid and defaced the primitive and simple truth,) their very first aggression must be upon that strange congeries of notions and practices of which the Lutheran doctrine of Justification is the origin and representative. *Whether any heresy has ever infested the Church, so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine, it is, perhaps, not necessary to determine; none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous.* It is not only that it denies some one essential doctrine of the Gospel, (as *e. g.* inherent righteousness,) this all heresies do; it is not only that it corrupts all sound Christian doctrine—nay, the very principle of orthodoxy itself; though this, also, it certainly does: but its inroads extend further than this; as far as its formal statements are concerned, it poisons at the very root, not Christianity only, but natural religion. That obedience to the will of God, with whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful; that sin is the one only danger to be avoided; these great truths are the very foundation of natural religion; and inasmuch as this modern system denies these to be *essential and necessary* truths, yea, counts it the chief glory of the Gospel, that, under it, they are no longer truths, we must plainly express our con-

\* *British Critic*, No. LXII., p. 446.

† This passage was published since the Charge was delivered.

viction, that a religious heathen, were he *really* to accept the doctrine which Lutheran *language* expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss, in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error.\*

I do not mean to engage you in an examination of the calumnious misrepresentations of this doctrine, by which the writer tries to provide some vindication for the virulence of his assault upon it. I only wish to lay before you this unequivocal declaration of the principles and feelings of the party upon this fundamental truth. And, I trust, that their instinctive dread and hatred of it, will illustrate, in some additional measure, its special importance in this contest, and quicken those who hold it, to a more jealous and vigorous defence of it at this time.

I shall make no attempt to trace regularly, the approximations to Rome which have accompanied this deepening hostility to Protestantism. They have gone on, naturally, *pari passu*. And it would seem now that no changes, however great, in our doctrine, or worship, or discipline, would come up to their notions of what is necessary to the perfection of the Church, if not to its very being, unless they led to reunion with Rome; and that upon the most unqualified terms of submission, which the highest maintainers of papal supremacy have claimed for the Chair of St. Peter.† And accord-

\* *British Critic*, No. LXIV., p. 390.

† Thus they not only say: 'Of course union of the Church under *one visible government* is abstractedly the most perfect state. We were so united, but now we are not;'—(*British Critic*, No. LIX. p. 2.) but they intimate that there is some doubt whether the Romanists are not right in regarding the want of this union as absolutely fatal to our claims to be a Church. 'We trust, of course, that active and visible union with the see of Rome is not of the essence of a Church, at the same time, we are deeply conscious that, in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a great privilege.'—*Ibid*, p. 3. They condemn such expressions as 'the blessings of emancipation from the Papal yoke,' as of a *bold and undutiful tenour*. They treat with the utmost scorn, the notion that they ought to suffer a desire to maintain union or heal divisions in our own Church, to interrupt the pursuit of this higher object. 'And on what single principle of Scripture or Tradition can the position be maintained, to meet the objectors on their own ground, that unity of a national Church is a legitimate object of ultimate endeavour? Both Scripture and Antiquity are clamorous and earnest indeed in favour of unity of the Church, but is the English establishment, the Church?'—*British Critic*, No. LXIV. p. 411,

ingly, every obstacle to this consummation has been gradually taken away. It has been ostentatiously stated, from time to time, that *we can have no union with Rome as she is: that she must change before we can become one again: that she must move towards us before we can move towards her*. And such declarations were confidently referred to, as a full answer to all apprehensions on that head. But, after allowing her a reasonable time, it was found, that she continued what and where she was, and that she gave no sign of any disposition to move towards us, or to make any such changes as might facilitate our moving towards her. And then it became necessary to discover that the hindrances which it was hopeless to expect that she would take away, were, in reality, no hindrances at all. And this work was set about in earnest,\* and has already advanced so far,

note. This is in reply to what is sometimes urged "in quarters justly claiming our deep honour and respect," viz. "that those who feel the real unity in essentials existing among 'High Churchmen' in England do ill in troubling such unity by making various statements about other Churches which cannot but give offence." "But we answer that it is not only among English High Churchmen, but foreign Catholics also, that we recognize such essential unity." In fine they acknowledge, that no form even of Romanism, short of Ultramontaniam, comes up to their views of true Church principles: "We can have no sympathy with the Gallican party, so far as it is at issue with the Ultra-montane. National theories, even the Gallican (which is also more or less the theory of every state in the Roman communion,) appear to us to involve a subtle Erastianism, besides betokening an inadequate estimate of the fulness and freedom of Gospel privileges."—No. LX. p. 465.

\* What promised to be the most formidable obstacle,—I do not mean from its own nature, which would be a very precarious way of judging, but from the language maintained by all the eminent Tractarians upon it,—was, the extent to which the honour due to the Creator is given to the creature, in the worship of saints in the Church of Rome, and especially of the blessed Virgin. If the Church were really guilty of idolatry, it would seem impossible that we should reunite with it. This would seem then an important point to be inquired into. But Mr. Newman lays down, quietly and incidentally, a broad general principle, which would preclude us from examining any of the offices of the Church, to see whether they are chargeable with this guilt or not, and which decides this important question, independently of any such evidence, and in spite of it: "I consider its existing creed and popular worship to be as near idolatry as any portion of that Church can be from which it is said that 'the idols' shall be 'utterly



that it cannot but be apparent that, (when their desires for re-union are so fervent,)

abolished.'—*Letter to Dr. Jelf*, p. 7. Whatever then be the proofs which the public offices of the Church of Rome may give of idolatry, they are not to be believed; for being a portion of that Church from which it is said that 'the idols' shall be 'utterly abolished,' however near she may appear to come to this crime, she cannot be guilty of it. [The object in this place is to distinguish between the decree of Trent on the subject of images, &c. and 'the existing creed and popular worship,' on the ground that the 'very words of themselves' of the decree, do not affirm or recommend what is believed and practised in the Church of Rome. But whether the distinction be satisfactory or not, it is quite superfluous. For suppose the *very words* of the Decree, of *themselves*, did affirm distinctly, and enjoin, idolatry in belief and practice, it is evident that the prophecy referred to by Mr. Newman (Isaiah ii. 18.) would be just as available to prove the Church's innocence of the crime, as it is in the case for which he uses it. But indeed, supposing every thing which is taken for granted in his *application* of the prophecy, (which is a good deal), *his inference* is plainly just as legitimate as it would be to collect from the fourth verse of the same chapter, that there never has been, and never can be, such a thing as war in Christendom; though Christian states may go as near to actual warfare as any kingdoms can, of which it is said, "Neither shall they learn war any more."] This principle, rightly used, would be enough for its purpose, but important contributions to the objects have since been made. Thus with reference to the mediæval honour to saints, it is denied that we have any right to pronounce upon the question, whether it gave to the creature what is due to the Creator. We may believe, if we will, that *we* could not use such language as St. Bernard, and St. Bonaventura are known to have used, without encroaching on God's honour, but to say that it did so in them is *inconceivable boldness*. 'Is it not a conceivable hypothesis (to say the very least) that holy and mortified men, whose conversation was in Heaven, may have entertained feelings of devotion and love—*e. g.* towards the blessed Virgin, which no human language can at all adequately express, and yet that their feelings towards our Lord should be altogether different in kind, and indefinitely stronger in degree? Yet what *words* could they *find* stronger than those applied to the blessed Virgin? What *words* can be stronger than the strongest?—*British Critic*, No. LXIV. p. 410, note.

Here is another pregnant principle. And finally, the whole subject is declared to be one upon which it is entirely beyond the competence of ordinary Christians to form *an opinion*. 'No one who has not fully mastered this great doctrine, [of the exaltation of the human nature by virtue of its union with the divine, in the person of our Lord,] is entitled to any opinion on a subject, which many however treat in an off-hand manner which is perfectly startling,—the question, namely,

these men must be kept back from joining her, by some better and stronger reasons, than any which can be furnished by the shadow of the differences between the Churches which they have allowed to remain in their Creed. Tract No. XC. showed, indeed, how they might, if they pleased, remain in the Church, how much soever of the belief of Rome they had embraced, but it does not explain why they should choose to do so. And why men who seem to have extirpated from their religious system every trace of anything which could raise a serious objection to union with Rome; and who entertain so high a sense of the blessings to be enjoyed in her communion, and so fervent a longing for them;—why they continue to exclude themselves from such blessings; and to subject themselves to the *isolation* under which they groan, and to all the perplexities and disadvantages of communion with a Church, which can barely be proved to be, not schismatical, and not un catholic, and even that, by a process of interpretation, of which it has been pronounced, by what they acknowledge to be the highest authority, that it is so subtle, that by it the Articles may be made to mean anything or nothing,—is certainly a question which may well perplex simple minds. It can hardly fail to suggest itself, that they remain in our Church rather for her sake than their own,—for what they hope to do for her, rather than what they enjoy in her, or hope from her. And this answer has been given to the question in quarters by no means unfavourable, whether well or ill informed.\* But whether

what is the full and legitimate development of Catholic doctrine on the exaltation and, intercessory power of the blessed Virgin.'—*Ibid.* p. 406. note.

\* In the Letters referred to page 178, note, the chief reason is said to be, that the harvest to the Church will be more abundant by a wise delay. Mr. Spencer says,—'When the Catholic movement first began to exhibit itself in so striking a manner at Oxford, which is the very heart of the Anglican Church, I never doubted but that it was the sign of a great regeneration about to take place in our country; but I did not understand the position which these learned ecclesiastics wished to take up, who are now guiding the most influential spirits in the Anglican Church. I was well aware that they still strongly repudiated all idea of going over from their Church to our own; but then I supposed this objection on their part to be a remnant of prejudices which would naturally lead them to hesitate a considerable time before taking so decisive a step. Indeed, quite

it be the true answer or not, it is very distinctly announced, that they have

lately I still held to the idea, that in a short time we should see them prepared to quit their Church in considerable numbers, and unite with us in labouring to effect the conversion of their brethren. But the nearer the approaches they make to Catholic sentiments, the more resolved they appear to be to rectify their position, not by quitting the vessel as if they despaired of its safety, but by guiding it together with themselves into the harbour of unity.—And the ‘young member of the University of Oxford,’ says, ‘We are little satisfied with our position. We groan at the sins committed by our ancestors in separating from the Catholic world. We experience a burning desire to be re-united to our brethren. We love with unfeigned affection the Apostolic See, which we acknowledge to be the head of Christendom, and the more because the Church of Rome is our mother, which sent from her bosom the blessed St. Augustine, to bring us her immovable faith. We admit, also, that it is not our formularies, nor even the Council of Trent, which prevent our union. After all these concessions, you may ask me, why, then do you not rejoin us? What is it that prevents you? Is it your formularies? But, according to yourself, you do not look upon them with a very favourable eye. Is it ours?—But in your opinion they do not contain any error?’ Of a long answer to these questions, the following passage is most to my purpose:—‘There are, at this moment in the Anglican Church, a crowd of persons who balance between Protestantism and Catholicism, and who, nevertheless, would reject with horror the very idea of a union with Rome. The Protestant prejudices which, for three hundred years, have infected our Church, are unhappily too deeply rooted there to be extirpated without a great deal of address. We must, then, offer, in sacrifice to God, this ardent desire which devours us, of seeing once more the perfect unity of the Church of Christ. We must still bear the terrible void which the isolation of our Church creates in our hearts, and remain till it pleases God to convert the hearts of our Anglican *confrères*, especially of our holy fathers the bishops. We are destined, I am persuaded, to bring back many wandering sheep to the knowledge of the truth. In fact the progress of Catholic opinions in England for the last seven years, is so inconceivable that no hope should appear extravagant. Let us, then, remain quiet for some years, till by God’s blessing, the ears of Englishmen are become accustomed to hear the name of Rome pronounced with reverence. At the end of this term you will soon see the fruits of our patience.’

The following passage seems to be intended to rebuke and allay the impatience which is naturally felt by members of the Church of Rome, when they find that those who have been so earnest and forward in every step of the way towards them, until they have come to the last, are so slow in resolving to take the last. It is in a style which has been

much more to do in and for the Church, and that they are determined to do it. The passage in which the future operations of the party are set forth, gives at the same time a very candid and instructive account of their past proceedings; and is so valuable both for what it proclaims and what it confesses, that though it is of some length, and has often been quoted, I shall repeat it to you now. It is from the *British Critic*, which has already supplied us with so many important statements. ‘By clinging to the authority of these Reformers, [the article is on Bishop Jewel,] as individuals, are we not dealing unfairly both with Protestants, and other branches of the Catholic Church? Are we not holding out false colours to the former, and drawing them near us only in the end to be alienated from us more completely than ever. On the other hand, are we not cutting ourselves off from the latter, (who are our natural allies,) by making *common cause with a set of writers, with whom, in such measure as we have imbibed the true Catholic spirit, we can have no sort of sympathy?* Meanwhile, to the unprejudiced inquirers after truth, (a large and growing number,) are we not, until we have spoken off such auxiliaries as these, exhibiting a very distorted and unreal representation of the Catholicism to

brought to great perfection by the writers of this school, in which they are able to say all that they want to say, and at the same time make provision to shelter themselves from its full responsibility. ‘Thus, as one instance of what we mean, the disproportioned anxiety they appear to manifest for the *immediate transfer of individuals to their ranks*, must result either from a shallow philosophy, or, more probably from *ignorance of the real state of things among ourselves*. We are, of course, not wishing them to lay aside their opinion that union with Rome is, *in the abstract*, essential, and is the natural *corona* of holy living, (because we are addressing them on their own grounds;) rather they seem not to feel this as so certain. . . . They seem almost to rejoice more over the accessions to their number, caused by mere argument, or mere imagination, than over all the indications, now so general, of reviving earnestness, which (we are arguing with them all along on *their own principles*) would seem to promise a far more plentiful, and incomparably more valuable reinforcement.’—*British Critic*, No. LXII., p. 294. And the author gives soon after this guarded but very significant sentence: ‘We repeat we are speaking *ad homines*; our own opinion, as we have before expressed, is, that individuals would *at present* act (in the abstract) quite unwarrantably in leaving us for Rome.’



which we desire to attract them ; holding before them a phantom which will elude their grasp, a light which will cheat their pursuit, unsettling their early prepossessions, without affording a complete and satisfactory equivalent ; disquieting them in their present home, without furnishing them even with a shelter ? This should be well considered. It ought not to be for nothing ; no, nor for anything short of some very vital truth ; some truth not to be rejected without fatal error, nor embraced without radical change ; that persons of name and influence should venture upon the part of ‘ecclesiastical agitators ;’ intrude upon the peace of the contented, and raise doubts in the minds of the uncomplaining ; vex the Church with controversy, alarm serious men, and interrupt the established order of things ; “set the father against the son, and the mother against the daughter ; and lead the taught to say, “I have more understanding than my teachers.” ALL THIS HAS BEEN DONE ; and all this is worth hazarding in a matter of life and death ; much of it is predicted as the characteristic result, and therefore the sure criterion, of the truth. An object thus momentous we believe to be the *unprotestantizing*, (to use an offensive, but forcible word,) of the national church ; and accordingly we are ready to endure, however we may lament, the undeniable, and in themselves disastrous effects of the pending controversy. But if, after all, we are not to be carried above the doctrine and tone of the English Reformers ; if we are to exchange a congenial enthusiasm for a timid moderation, a vigorous extreme for an unreal mean, an energetic Protestantism for a stiff and negative Anglicanism, we see but poor compensation for so extensive and irreparable a breach of peace and charity. The object, important as it may be in itself, is quite inadequate to the sacrifice.

“We cannot stand where we are ; we must go backwards or forwards ; and it will surely be the latter. It is absolutely necessary towards the consistency of the system which certain parties are labouring to restore, *that truths should be clearly stated, which as yet have been but intimated, and others developed which are now but in germ. And as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation.*”\*

Here is a distinct proclamation of what is before us. But before I look at the prospective part, I must ask you to con-

in the same periodical on some recent episcopal charges, for which they profess to be able to render the humblest and most reverential acknowledgments. ‘Even by the admissions and the very complaints of those persons who are most opposed to us, the general tenor of the charges delivered during the past year has been in a most unprecedented degree in favour of Catholic views. . . . . It has, indeed, been most gratifying ; and we beg to assure our friends, we most entirely partake of the solicitude some of them have expressed, that so far as this periodical is concerned, nothing may be done to forfeit such high and encouraging testimonies.’ I only give this extract for the promise of moderation which it contains, and which, combined with the special reason assigned for making the promise, seems to give security that the article will be as moderate as it can be made. It is in this point of view peculiarly interesting. I shall give a few extracts from it. After maintaining that there is a necessity for a further development of Catholicism in the Church, to meet the development of its Protestantism, which it asserts is constantly going on, it is said : “By some it will be deemed that there is no such conflict as that alleged between Catholicism and Protestantism, and, therefore, no such apparent necessity for a movement or development, and that the question really lies between the errors of Romanism and the principles of the Reformation. Now, we confess, and we say it most seriously and with all respect, we think this last expression, ‘the principles of the Reformation,’ to be a most dangerous and delusive chimera. It betrays an evil original by a certain unstable, fleeting, receding, and vanishing character. What are the principles of the Reformation ?—I omit the answer to make room for what is connected with the future progress of the movement. ‘Now, in the course of these inquiries after truth, which not the caprice of individuals, but the very exigencies of the times have compelled upon all serious and thinking men, it appears to many minds, that there exists a Catholic system, no dream, but an historical reality, no more identical with the Church of England, than Protestantism is identical with it, though practically, *to a great extent*, compatible with it ; that this Catholic system *includes a great deal, both in the way of believing and doing*, which is at least recommended to us by an immense weight of probability, and by sanctions still higher than a mere preponderance of testimony, *partially and equivocally allowed by the Church of England* ; that that Catholic system, with whatever faults it may be mixed and overlaid here and there, has this immense note of truth and Divinity, that it does safely enshrine and keep what we consider essential, *whereas our own actual system fails to do so* ; that thus, what with reference to our notions, we should call the unessential part, in that Catholic system seems to be providentially preservative of

\* *British Critic*, No. LIX. p. 45. In the course of this year (1843) an article appeared

sider for a moment what is hardly less valuable, the frank avowal which it contains of the past proceedings of the party. All the while that the course of aggression and agitation, which is so well described in this extract, was going on, from time to time, credit was most confidently taken, by the chief agents in it, (and too often given to them,) for the quietness and moderation of their proceedings; and while all was really (as is now confessed,) development and advancement, they referred boldly to their 'stationariness,' as of itself enough to

the essential part; that, for example, certain views of the sacraments and certain views of the condition of the saints, in our relation to them, contribute to a fuller belief of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and fuller appropriation of its benefits; and that, after all, there is that great self-supporting harmony in the Catholic system, and vast authority for it, which seems to indicate that there is something unwarranted and arbitrary in the distinctions usually made among us between essentials and unessentials." It is almost unnecessary to add, that they who have come to these conclusions, "see no other way by which she [the English Church] can preserve what she has, and what distinguishes her from the errors of her most prominent enemies. They do not see how she can arrest the actual progress of dissolution, *without becoming more Catholic*. They see clearly that the principle of maintaining things just as they are, of resting content exactly with that measure of doctrine and practice which the Church of England enjoins or recommends, or of aiming at a certain imaginary mean, does not answer against heresy. . . . They see that nothing can resist the enthusiastic and all-risking irruption of unbelief, except an equally enthusiastic and all-risking effort in the direction of Catholic doctrine." No. LXV. p. 289, 281. Most of this is very plain. But to explain the part of it, which asserts that our system is unable to enshrine and keep what is essential, whereas the Catholic system does so, I ought to add, that the writer states his conviction, that some of the doctrines relating to the blessed Trinity, 'to mention one, the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, are now all but rejected by the mass of the Church of England.' There is no reason, I suppose to apprehend that many readers will mistake this statement for anything near the truth. It is very hard to believe indeed, that the writer does; or that such outrageous exaggeration is any thing better than a politic device, to frighten the timid into acquiescing in the further catholicising of the Church,—in the introduction of certain views of the sacraments, and certain views of the condition of the saints, and our relation to them,—as essential to the conservation of the true doctrine of the Incarnation of our blessed Lord.

quiet the minds of those who were at first startled by what they taught.\* And all this while, all who opposed the men—who, according to this frank confession, were *intruding upon the peace of the contented, and raising doubts in the minds of the uncomplaining, vexing the Church with controversy, alarming serious men, and interrupting the established order of things*,—were held up as wanton disturbers of the Church's peace; and all who raised a warning voice, as to the objects and tendencies of this movement,—which, it is now acknowledged, has carried all within its vortex far, and must carry them farther and farther, from the principles of the Reformation,—were stigmatised as causeless alarmists.

And this is a matter of practical interest at this moment. For up to this moment, the movement is advancing, under just the same pacific professions; and the same imputations are still cast upon all who in any way impede its progress. Even the English bishops, who have officially expressed any disapprobation of the principles or the proceedings of the party, have not escaped such animadversions. Very lately, upon the delivery of some Charges, a letter was addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by one of the most eminent of the Tractarians,† in which his Grace's brethren, who had spoken more or less in condemnation of parts of the teaching of the School, were reprehended—in the blindest tones, and with all professions of respect for their office, and for themselves, too, but still distinctly reprehended,—as speaking in the language of reproof and warning, without any just cause, and without any thorough understanding of the views which they condemned. Indeed this ig-

\* "The very fact that things remain as they were, has a tendency to reassure men's minds, since it is ever the tendency of novelty and schismatical teaching, to develop itself further, and detach itself more from the doctrines of the Church; stationariness is a proof of adherence to some fixed and definite standard."—*Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, Preface, p. i.

† *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on some circumstances connected with the present crisis in the English Church*, by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D. It gave occasion to a most excellent Pamphlet, *The case as it is*, by the Rev. William Goode. If I should chance to have any readers who are unacquainted with it, I desire very earnestly to recommend it to them.



norance is described as almost unavoidable, in some of them, because "the narrowness of what one must call the non-conformist system, cannot span the largeness of Catholic truth;" and having the truths, which they show themselves jealous about, "fixed in their minds, in the (one may say so without disrespect, as speaking of the system, not of the respected individuals,) somewhat bald and naked way which characterizes the Genevan School, and measuring doctrines as they stand in other systems, by the character which they would have in their own, they must condemn them."

There is more in abundance, in the same respectful strain, on the Charges already delivered: but the Letter, it is confessed, is chiefly written for the sake of those which are to come, 'in the hope that they who may hereafter speak, will speak, as in fuller possession of the manifold bearings of what they have to deliver.' And to this end, the writer draws out for their information, an imposing array of the various temptations which allure men at the present day to the Church of Rome; and reminds them, that 'while there are these real attractions towards the Roman Church, (however more than counterbalanced in well disciplined and humble hearts,) we must admit that there are also real difficulties in the position of our Church, which must be felt more keenly, as people realize more the doctrine of the unity of the Church.' And he suggests, that, if to both be added the condemnation of Catholic truth, on the part of the heads of the Church, the consequences must be disastrous. The author professes not to write on behalf of himself or his friends; —the temptations to leave their own Church are not likely to prevail with them, as they may with younger men, 'they have been brought on their way past middle life, and *may the rather look to close it as they have begun.*' Nor need they dread the coming censure for themselves personally; 'for themselves, they have enough in their acquittal, some years past, by *their own bishop*,'\* and besides, they are ready to bear any thing that may be laid upon them. Nor

again need they dread for their cause, anything that the Bishops can say or do, as 'with respect,' the writer takes care to notify to his Grace, for the information and guidance of his brethren: 'My Lord, with respect, I may say, it is too late for any mere check. It is not by any warning, as to any of our supposed tendencies, or by cautions, as to any particular statements, or by silencing any one or more of us, that things can be stayed. When the whole ocean is stirred from its depths, to what end to stay, if we could, a single wave?\*' 'It is not for ourselves that I write; it is for our Church, lest she hereafter lose some of the flower of her sons; it is for them, lest they be lost to the office for which God has designed them.' How this is likely to take place is thus explained: "They have been formed, or formed themselves, in what we feel assured is Catholic teaching, in its main outlines, instilled into us in our Liturgy and Catechism, taught in our Homilies, at the least consistent with our Articles, even where these are less definite. This belief has become part of themselves, they cannot part with it; assured that God has given it to them, through his Church, that it is part of the treasure committed to her keeping. Us, (however unworthy, such as myself, and however imperfectly any of us may have set forth that system,) they look upon as its representatives in our Church. If, then, they who are in authority seem from want of sufficient explanation to censure our teaching broadly, it comes to them like a rejection of themselves from our Church. They find their belief disavowed, themselves disowned; whither are they to turn? It is not come to this yet; they who have here spoken have been but a few: but it has been a distressing presage of what was to follow. 'If all, or the majority of our Bishops so speak,' is their feeling, 'will it not be a virtual disavowal of Catholic doctrine by the heads of our Church? And will it be safe to abide in the Church, whose heads shall have so disavowed it? This may be an undue anxiety about the morrow, and a mistrust of God's Providence over our ancient Church, which for so many centuries he has protected. I am not saying whether they ought so to feel; I am

\* P. 84.—'But, my Lord, much confusion has arisen from people's forgetting that it is to our own diocesan, not to other bishops, that we owe obedience. All we should respect for their office sake, but it is to our own that we are to listen.'—*Letter* p. 39

stating what their feelings are.”\* “If this goes on, my Lord, where is it to end? If our own bishops, and others encouraged by them, say to us,—sore as it is to repeat, they are their own words, ‘Get thee hence, Satan,’—while those of the Roman communion pray for us, and invite us, is it not sorely adding to the temptations, I say, not of ourselves, but of younger men? . . . If a mark is thus set upon us, and we are disowned, things cannot abide thus. For us who are elder, it might be easy to retire from the weary strife, if it should be ever necessary, into lay communion, or seek some other branch of our Church, which would receive us; but for the young whose feelings are not bound up with their Church by the habits and mercies of many years, and to whom labouring in her service is not become a second nature, an element in our existence, their sympathies will have vent, and, if they find themselves regarded as outcasts from their church—to a Church they must belong, and they will seek Rome.”†

As the only mode of averting this calamity, the writer asks for ‘sympathy.’ He complains that the praise hitherto bestowed upon them, with some inconsiderable exceptions, has been so given, that it might seem, or at least be represented, as in extenuation of the censure inflicted on the same occasions. ‘What we fear is lest a deep despondency about ourselves and our Church, come over people’s minds, and they abandon her, as thinking her case hopeless; or lest individuals who are removed from the sobering influence of this ancient home of the Church, should become fretted and impatient at these unsympathising condemnations, and the continued harrassing of the unseemly strife carried on under the shelter of your Lordships’ names; and losing patience should lose also the guidance vouchsafed to the patient.’‡ And therefore for the Church’s sake he craves, ‘if it may be, sympathy and direction,’ but, ‘at the least, peace.’||

I do trust that they to whom this submissive menace is addressed, will not be deterred from discharging the duties

which rest upon them at this crisis, by any apprehensions of the defection with which they are threatened. I hope I shall never speak lightly of any thing so sad and sinful, as the renunciation upon the part of any of the members of our Church, of the matchless blessings which God allows us to enjoy in her communion. But the worst of all this is over, when men have already been brought to scorn these blessings,—to reject the sound doctrine which our Church professes, and to despise the pure worship which it provides. And if there be any who will only continue among us, on the condition, that those who are engaged in *unprotestantizing* the Church, and who are labouring to lead her, with themselves, farther and farther from the principles of the English Reformation, shall be allowed to proceed in their work without opposition or interruption; I cannot think that they incur, or inflict, any serious loss, when they go over bodily to the opposite ranks. And I am very sure that the apprehension, which is attempted to be infused into the heads of the Church, that if they speak distinctly and decidedly upon the principles and designs of this party, the slender and precarious tie which binds such persons to her, will be broken, would be a very bad reason for suppressing or softening any words of reproof and warning which they may feel that the crisis demands.

They will, I doubt not, discharge the duty that rests upon them faithfully. May we all, my brethren, each in his place, be kept faithful to our duty in this trying time. An arduous one at best it is. But it ought to be somewhat lightened by our being forewarned of its difficulties. And we now know what is before us. A struggle—for I do trust we are united in a determination to struggle in this cause—a struggle, with those who avow that it is their purpose, at all hazards, and at all costs, to *unprotestantize* the National Church;—and who, far as they have already receded, acknowledge and proclaim, that they are bound, and that they are resolved, to *recede more and more from the principles of the English Reformation*.

These are bold words. And if we looked at the ability of the ‘ecclesiastical agitators,’ (as they candidly style themselves,) who employ them—at their energy, combination, and perseverance, at the means which they have at command, and at the effects which they have already produced,—we might well listen to their

\*Pp. 43, 44.

†A little further on, he says, that “Among those in whose minds serious misgiving have been raised, are not merely what would be called ‘young men’; there are, one may say, some of the flower of the English Church.”—Pp. 86, 89

‡ Page 90.

|| Ibid. 136.



words with fear. And moreover, when we look back upon the use which we have been making of the blessings and privileges which we enjoy in our Reformed Church, we have added reason to dread, that it may be the will of God to withdraw for a time from the land, the light, which has shone for so long, and which has been so neglected and so abused. But we are not without cheering indications on the other hand, that He whose mercy endureth forever, does not intend for us this heavy chastisement, which we most righteously have deserved. And, among these indications of His gracious purposes for us, one to which here and now I naturally turn, is this: that He has not brought us into these unexampled perils, without making a visible preparation to enable us to meet them. I believe, that while at no former period did the clergy manifest more piety and zeal, there never was a period in which they were more soundly informed; and that, in particular, the true principles of our Church were never so well known by her ministers, and never more deeply valued. I believe that this is the case in England; I am sure it is so amongst ourselves. And I do hope, that these men will find that they have under-rated the attachment of the clergy, and of the people of England too, to the principles against which they have declared open war;—that the astonishing success which has intoxicated them, and beguiled them into this salutary manifesto, has been the result of ignorance,—most incomprehensible, and inexcusable, but still real, ignorance of their designs, and that now that they have unequivocally declared themselves, their success will come to an end.

Here, at least, I am confident that a resolute resistance is prepared for them. This attempt to *unprotestantize* our Church, will, I feel assured, unite us all in defence of the principles of the English Reformation. I feel assured that all who hear me now will be found upon this side in the coming struggle, and that, however determined these men may be, still further to recede from them,—they will find you not less determined to cleave to, and to uphold, the principles of the English Reformation. I might seem to have ample grounds for this confidence in the bare fact, that you are bound by the strongest and most solemn obligations to maintain and defend those principles. But, alas! so are these men, who have declared, as you have heard, irreconcilable

hostility to them. Their example shows, that such bonds—strong as they seem to be—may be broken as a thread. But, I trust, that you have taken up no views of your allegiance to the Church Universal which can set you free from the engagements by which you are bound to your own Church. And I trust, moreover, that you are held not by such bonds only, but by firm attachment, to the principles of the English Reformation;—that of the direct obligations which you have entered into with respect to them, there are none which you did not cordially contract, none that you repent of, and none that you are not resolved to maintain. I have a happy confidence that this is true, and not of you only, but of a vast majority of your brethren in the ministry throughout this land. And in this, in concurrence with many other marks of the favour of the Most High, I see a good foundation for the hope, that, however severe and varied be the trials, from within and from without, which He has appointed to our Church, they are but the course discipline by which He is training her for a higher destiny,—to be a more honoured instrument in His service: that in all that is alarming at this crisis, He is speaking to her in accents of admonition, not of wrath; and that if she hear His voice, and humble herself, and repent, and do her first works, *she shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared for every good work.*

But these hopes are not to blind us to the real and great dangers to which all that is most valuable in our Church,—her sound scriptural faith, and her pure and simple worship—are exposed. It is my sense of the great and imminent perils with which these blessings are now threatened, that has led me to address you on this occasion at such unusual length. And long as my address has been, I feel, not merely how imperfectly I have spoken upon the important subjects which I have brought under your notice, but that there are many on which I should have desired, and may fairly have been expected to speak, which I have wholly omitted. It is too late for any attempt to repair such deficiencies. I can only ask—and I do so in all earnestness and sincerity—for your prayers, my brethren, that these, and all other the manifold defects and imperfections, which belong to all my efforts to discharge the

duties which rest upon me, may be graciously pardoned, and effectually supplied, and made to promote the glory of God and the good of His Church ; and that I may daily receive grace, more and more entirely to devote myself to His service. I trust I may be enabled, in my measure, to offer the like prayers from time to time on your behalf: and now *I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace.*



# APPENDIX.

## Note A. page 21.

THE fact, that by far the greater number of the Lord's most striking miracles which are recorded in the Gospels, were performed in the face of great multitudes, would seem to be a very embarrassing one to the theory maintained in the Tracts on Reserve. The following is the only notice which appears of it in either number. 'And if we take the instance of those miracles which appear to have been the most public, those, for instance, of the loaves and fishes, with five thousand persons [*men, beside women and children,*] on one occasion, and four thousand [*men, beside women and children,*] on the other, partaking of them; even here it would appear as if there were somehow a sort of secret character about the miracle, for the multitudes were afterwards following our Saviour, because they ate of the bread, but not considering the miracle; and of the disciples themselves, of whom it is said, (by some doubtless very important coincidence of expression of the four evangelists on both occasions,) that they distributed the bread as it grew in their hands, it is said immediately after on the sea, that they considered not the miracle. It was not, therefore, even on this public occasion, like an overpowering sign from heaven, but the divine agency even here retiring in some degree from view, as His natural providence.\*

Now, upon this I must begin by remarking, how delusive and irreverent is this mode of disposing of an objection which Scripture offers to the writer's theory. There are, as I have said, a large class of adverse cases. The writer takes two of them (which for this purpose are but one), and attempts to reconcile them to his views by a process, which rests upon something so peculiar to them, that, however successful it were in accounting for them, it could not, by any possibility be supposed to account for, or to do anything to account for, the others. And, so all the others are left, without any attempt to abate their force, as objections to his theory, amounting, in fact, to nothing less than this: that the application which he makes of his theory of Reserve to the miracles of the blessed Lord, is inconsistent with a leading fact in the history of, not one or two, but almost all the most striking of His miracles recorded in the Gospel!

I must repeat, therefore, that this would be a most delusive and irreverent mode of disposing of the objection which the Lord's pub-

lic miracles offer to the writer's theory, even supposing that he had succeeded in reconciling it to the only public miracle which he notices. But how entirely he has failed in doing this, will appear upon looking a little more closely at what he says.

The first thing that I choose to notice in his attempt, which I have just quoted, is the strange assertion: that of the disciples themselves 'it is said, (*by some doubtless very important coincidence of expression by the four evangelists on both occasions,*) that they distributed the bread as it grew in their hands,' &c.

It is not easy to say all that ought to be said upon this very extraordinary passage; for—  
1. The second of the two occasions is recorded by only two of the Evangelists; an inaccuracy which would scarcely be worth noticing, except as showing the wonderful carelessness of the writer in dealing with Holy Scripture. 2. *No one of the Evangelists uses, on either occasion, the expression which is ascribed to all four upon both,* and ascribed to them in a way which directs such special attention to the words. What foundation, indeed, the statement has in the simple words of the Gospel narratives, it would be hard even to guess. 3. If such an expression had been used by the four Evangelists, or by any one of them, it might certainly have formed some foundation for the notion, that in this miracle *the divine agency retired in some degree from public view, as in God's natural providence.* But, even then, this notion could hardly be maintained by any one who read to the end of the narratives. For could the same speculation be applied to what is actually recorded in all of them—viz. that after the hunger of the multitude was fully satisfied, several baskets full (on the occasion related by all, twelve, on the additional occasion recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, seven) of the fragments of the food were gathered up by the disciples? Even if, then, the Evangelists had actually said, that the *disciples distributed the bread as it grew in their hands,* (which they do not), and if, so far, their narrative might suggest the notion that *the Divine agency was retiring on the occasion in some degree from view, as His natural providence,* and that they were, therefore, unconscious of the miraculous character of the work which they were performing, while it was going on, could this unconsciousness have continued, when they themselves gathered together and put into baskets a quantity of food visibly exceeding vastly the whole quantity which they had at

the beginning for distribution? Could they have remained insensible to the miracle after this, even if they had been unconscious of it before? And it seems worth remarking, as bearing upon the question of His *reserve* on the occasion, that we are expressly told by St. John (vi. 12) that this was done by the direct command of the blessed Lord Himself: "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." And we are told by St. Matthew (xvi. 9—16), and by St. Mark (viii. 19, 20), that when He recalled these wonders to their mind, He dwelt especially upon this fact, as marking beyond a doubt the miraculous nature of what had been done.

The quantity of fragments left after the multitude had eaten, which they were, as it were, *made* to notice, would, of itself, prove to most unprejudiced minds, that those who witnessed what was done could not have been unconscious of its miraculous character. And the Lord's having so specially directed their attention to it at the time, is an equally satisfactory proof that He could not have intended that they should be unconscious of the miracle.\* But it is attempted to be shown that we have some special reason to conclude that they actually were, from the language employed about both the multitude and the disciples, in the Gospels. For, 1. 'The multitudes were afterwards following our Saviour, because they ate of the bread, but not considering the miracle;' and 2. Of the disciples themselves, 'it is said immediately after on the sea, but they considered not the miracle.'

Now, 1. what is said of the multitude (though there is nothing in Scripture exactly corresponding to it) is, I suppose, drawn from the Gospel of St. John, where we are told that when they found that He had crossed the sea towards Capernaum, they also took shipping and came to Capernaum seeking for Jesus, and that instead of commending their zeal, He reproveth them, and said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." But it would be very strange to infer from this rebuke, that when they witnessed the miracle, they did not know that it was a miracle,—which is the

\* This is of great importance to the writer's argument. Indeed it is plain that their ignorance of the miraculous nature of the act, (if they could be shown to be ignorant of it) would be no proof of the Lord's *reserve* in the case, except in the degree in which their ignorance might be presumed to have arisen from His intention that it should be concealed from them. Now that He did not intend that it should, is sufficiently proved by what I have noticed above. But, moreover, that He could hardly have had any such intention, is evident from the fact, that just before, He had wrought divers miracles in the face of this same multitude, who beheld them with wonder. "And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them: insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, the blind to see; and they glorified the God of Israel." Matt. xv. 30, 31.

point, be it remembered, that the writer has to make good.\* On the contrary it seems plain that they were following the Lord in the expectation of being again miraculously fed by him. And that what he reproves them for, is, that the miracle which they had witnessed awoke no feelings in their hearts that He who had thus miraculously supplied their bodily wants, was able to minister to their spiritual necessities;—that, eagerly as they followed His traces, it was not under any sense of such wants, or with any desire of the "meat which endureth unto everlasting life," but in the hope that He would give them again of the "meat that perisheth." What follows, in which He in vain endeavours to raise these higher desires in their minds, and to lead them to look upon Him in this His higher office, can hardly be read by any one without perceiving that this was the case. And at all events (what is enough for the particular point) it must be evident, that the multitude were following Him just because they knew that He had once miraculously fed them, and hoped that He would do so again.

2. It is further urged, that of the disciples themselves, it is said immediately afterwards upon the sea, that they "considered not the miracle." The reference here is of course to Mark vi. 52. And no doubt the place shows that they had not carried away, or at least did not retain such an impression of the Lord's divine power as might naturally be expected to be the result of so stupendous a miracle—and that so they were as unprepared for a new exercise of his miraculous powers, and as amazed when they witnessed one, as those might be who had never seen any wonder wrought by Him.†

\* Indeed he has, properly speaking, somewhat more to prove, (though I do not think it necessary to introduce what must lengthen an examination which without it is so much too long.) viz., that their ignorance sprang from some designed veiling of the miraculous nature of the act. See the preceding note.

† This seems to be the ground of the condemnatory sentence in St. Mark vi. 52: for it stands in immediate connexion with his account of the way in which they were affected by the supernatural calming of the storm immediately upon the Lord's entering the ship: "And they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered. For they considered not the miracle of the loaves: for their heart was hardened." Strong as the language of the Evangelist is in stating the fact, if we had his narrative only, without his comment upon it, we could not be sure, (perhaps it would not occur to us to think (that there was anything more in the feelings which he described than due awe and wonder at this manifestation of the divine power of the Lord. But learning from his comment that their state of mind as exhibited by their amazement was blame-worthy, when we look back upon it, to see in what it was reprehensible, we are irresistibly led to conclude, I think, that it was in their not having received, or at least retained, such an impression of the Lord's character, from the miracle of the loaves which they had witnessed, as would prepare them to see any fresh display of the same divine power (with whatever awe,) at least without the stupid wonder of those, to whom no such manifestation of what He was had been vouchsafed. And this is confirmed by His own rebuke



It must be plain, however, that nothing more is conveyed to us in what is said here by the evangelist of the disciples. And it is hardly necessary to add, that this furnishes no kind of foundation for the inference which is attempted to be drawn from it. The fact, that so soon after such miracles the impressions which they ought to have produced upon those who witnessed them, seem to have disappeared, may be a very extraordinary fact; but the inference from it—that the miraculous character of the acts at the time of their performance, was not perceptible, or even that it was not actually perceived by those very persons, is certainly a very rash one. I can guess no principle upon which such an inference rests, except this: that if such miracles had been at the time felt and acknowledged, they must have produced such practical impressions with respect to the power by which they were wrought as could not so soon be effaced. I need hardly take the trouble of saying anything upon the very hasty and superficial views of the nature of the human mind, on which this principle is founded; because its unsoundness must appear sufficiently from what every one has observed, (and I suppose hardly any one is without unhappy personal experience of the same kind,) of the rapidity with which what appear to be indelible impressions upon the feelings fade away. But I think it worth noticing, that it has been used in a way, which would have made a writer of ordinary caution very slow to aid in giving it currency. For by virtue of this very principle, Lord Bolingbroke finds himself able to prove that the miracles of the Exodus, as recorded by Moses, were never in fact wrought.\* And certainly if the divine be allowed to say: These men could not have known that what they saw was a miracle, or they would not have been so transiently impressed by it;—it seems hard to prevent the infidel from taking the further step, and leading others too to take it: These men could not have witnessed a miracle, or the impressions which it must have produced would not so soon have disappeared.

And now I suppose no more is necessary, to convince my readers that it is nothing short of a most indefensible abuse of Holy Scripture, to represent the Gospel narratives of the miraculous feeding of the multitude, as affording any ground for supposing, or indeed any excuse for imagining, that *there was somehow a sort of secret character about this miracle*, so that though from the nature of it, the Lord was constrained, as it were, to perform it in

public, yet there was no breach of reserve, in the performance of it, for that *the divine agency retired in some degree from view as in His natural providence*, and that so the multitudes who ate, and the disciples who fed them, were unconscious of the miracle. And yet this is not all. The position of the writer, viz. that in these two public miracles the miraculous character of what was done, was in some way hidden from those who witnessed it—not merely rests upon nothing better than the very extraordinary misrepresentations and perversions of Holy Scripture which I have been so long exposing, but is sustained against its positive and express testimony. For we are expressly told by St. John, “*THEN THOSE MEN, WHEN THEY HAD SEEN THE MIRACLE WHICH JESUS DID, SAID, THIS IS OF A TRUTH THAT PROPHET THAT SHOULD COME INTO THE WORLD,*” John vi. 14. And immediately after, he tells us that the Lord was obliged to withdraw himself from them, because “*HE PERCEIVED THAT THEY WOULD COME AND TAKE HIM BY FORCE TO MAKE HIM A KING.*”

I do not believe that outside the Tracts, (and the other publications of their authors) it would be easy to find such an example of *handling the word of God*—I will not say, *deceitfully*—but certainly with the most irreverent carelessness. If it were a solitary or a rare instance, it would have been inexcusable to have spent so much space and labour upon it. But such instances abound in these writings. It is no exaggeration to say that a moderate-sized volume might be made out, (and a very useful one it would be,) of hardly less flagrant examples, from the Tracts, and the other publications of the Tractarian school. I have given some remarkable instances in the Charge. But even the Tracts upon Reserve would supply a considerable number in addition, to which I have not been able to advert in any way. To treat the subject properly, indeed, would be impossible within any moderate limits. But it is one which I felt to be of such great importance, that I could not entirely pass it over. In fact I hardly regard even the grievous errors which the Tractarians have advocated, as likely in themselves to do more extensive injury, than their mode of supporting them, and most of all the abuse of Scripture to which they have inured a large class of readers. I trust that even the notice which I have been able to take of this peculiar feature of their writings, will have the effect of directing more attention to it. And I thought that a thorough examination of a single instance was more likely to make a useful impression than a slighter notice of a greater number. I am sure that a fair consideration even of this one instance, on which I have dwelt so long, would do a great deal to secure any right-minded reader from putting himself in the hands of writers, who, though putting forward for themselves almost exclusive claims to reverence for Revelation, and rebuking rather arrogantly the want of it in others, really treat Holy Scripture with the most arbitrary violence; make it prove and disprove what they like; and see in it what they want, and nothing else.

to them, when, after they had seen both the miracles of feeding the multitude, (See Matt. xvi. 5—12. Mark viii. 14—21,) they show that they think of Him still as of one to be perplexed and made anxious by their having forgotten to take bread with them in crossing the sea. He rebukes them for their *little faith*, reminds them of what they had seen of what he was able to do, and asks them, *How is it that ye do not understand?* (The word is the same as that translated *consider* in Mark vi 52.)

\* *Essays addressed to Mr. Pope.* Essay the Third. Section II.

Note B. p. 34.

It must be a startling thing to one to whom this system is new, to find how much of God's word,—and how much of that most interesting part of His word, that which exhibits Him in relation to sinners,—it rejects as inapplicable to sinners in the Christian Church. All that is addressed to God's rebellious and back-sliding children in the Old Testament; all the expostulations, and the invitations, and the promises delivered to them in His name, are set aside from our use: they were addressed indeed to His children, but they were not *regenerate* children. All the Lord's gracious declarations recorded in the New Testament, of God's mercy to sinners, and of His readiness to receive them and pardon them,—all His own invitations, and pleadings, and promises,—even the great and precious promise, *Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out*,—all were still addressed to Jews, and cannot be transferred to the very different state of those who have been baptized, and have fallen into *deadly* sin. The whole scheme of *justification by faith*, as explained, illustrated, guarded, and supported in the epistles, is in the same way rendered useless to the Christian Church, except in her missions among the heathen. In the same way, too, the consolation of the examples of this free mercy which are recorded in the Bible, is taken from us. Do we turn to David's aggravated sin, and to God's prompt and gracious forgiveness of it? We are reminded that David was not *baptized*. To Peter's shameful fall, and merciful restoration? He was not *regenerate*.—And so on.

But why should our regeneration prevent the application to us of the general invitations to *ALL* sinners to return and to repent, which are to be met with in God's word everywhere, founded as they are upon the most general declarations of God's readiness to show mercy to *ALL* sinners, and upon the testimony that Christ's blood cleanseth from *ALL* sin? It would seem not merely a happier, but a truer view of the relation into which we are brought by baptism, to regard it as securing to us *by covenant* that mercy, which, when declared and promised to those under the Law, wore something the air of what was *extraordinary*, and, if one may use such a word without fear of being mistaken, *irregular*, as regarded the dispensation under which it was promulgated. I do not mean to say, that the New Covenant did not do a great deal more for us than this, but that it did this. But we need not argue that such was its effect. All that we need say is,—what every one who entertains anything like due reverence for Scripture, must feel to be true,—that we are not at liberty to admit that it had, and to such an extent, the effect of rendering inapplicable to us, so much of Scripture which is conceived in the most general form, unless there be some express authority from Scripture to show that we are not to make such an application of it. Is there any such declaration in God's word that they do not so apply? Any warning against so applying them to others or ourselves? No: it is not

proposed to justify the limitation by Scripture authority, but by reasoning. They were actually addressed to those who did not possess the peculiar privileges and the special grace which we enjoy, as members of the Christian Church. And if, having received this grace, we fall from it into deadly sin, our guilt is far more grievous. And we have no right to transfer to ourselves God's dealings, or His language towards those in whom sin was so widely different,—evincing so much less depravity and power of evil.

This seems the amount of the reasoning by which this setting aside of the declarations and invitations and promises of Scripture, is justified! But I cannot think that it does anything to relieve the procedure from the charge of great and indeed awful presumption. And I am very sure that if the plain and natural meaning of any portion of Scripture which did not in the same way oppose these men's theories, were set aside upon such reasoning, or better, they would not be slow to bestow very frank censure upon such a mode of dealing with revelation.

But indeed, supposing it to be right to settle such a point in that way, the reasoning seems strangely weak and unsatisfactory. We can be very sure—Scripture and reason combine to assure us—that the guilt of sin is greater in the degree in which the light enjoyed by the sinner, and the grace bestowed upon him, are greater. But God's declarations of mercy in Christ Jesus are made expressly concerning *all* sin,—not small or slight sins,—but *all* sin. His invitations are in words addressed—not to sinners before baptism—but to *ALL* sinners,—and they are limited by no condition, except that they shall repent, and believe in the Saviour, *whose blood cleanseth from ALL* sin. And what right have we to determine, that *deadly* sin in a baptized sinner is not within the scope of such declarations, and that a baptized sinner is beyond the reach of those invitations? What is meant by such an assertion? Is it meant that such sin is of too deep guilt for the blood of Christ to wash away, and for the mercy of God in Christ to forgive? No, it will be said, that is not meant. What is meant is, that this sin, which it is confessed evinces deeper depravity in the sinner, than the same sin committed by one to whom such grace was not imparted, shows also a state which makes it harder for the sinner to repent; and more unlikely that he will repent. Be it so. But what has this to do with the question upon which we are at present? How does this furnish any proof of the principle, that the passages of Holy Scripture referred to do not apply to their case? The declarations and invitations and promises of which I speak, say nothing, and intimate nothing, of the ease or difficulty with which different sinners repent. From the nature of the case, that must be very different in different cases. They say nothing of the likelihood or unlikelihood of their repentance. According to human calculation, *it* varies in the same way. The passages of Scripture to which I refer, do not touch upon this. They invite all sinners to repent; they declare that God is ready to receive all sinners who do



repent; and they promise to all who repent, free pardon and full acceptance for Christ's sake. What right have we to say, that these precious promises of the word of God do not apply to a certain class of sinners, because we think from their circumstances it is unlikely they will repent? The blessings of reconciliation offered, will not be theirs until they repent. By the very terms of the offers and promises, none of those blessings will be theirs if they do not repent. It is only if they do, and when they do, that these blessings are to be theirs. How can it be thought then, that the difficulty of their repenting, or its unlikelihood, forbids the application of these passages of Scripture to them?

Now beyond these two effects of the grace and privileges of the Christian, it is not easy to understand any others, which have any apparent application in this case. They, upon common and admitted principles, aggravate the guilt of his sin,—make the same sin greater in him than it would be in one to whom they were not given;—and they, in the degree in which they make his sin greater, make his repentance harder.\* But I suppose that I have shown, that neither of these effects is any warrant for denying that the portions of Scripture to which I have referred, apply to Christians, no less than to those to whom they were first addressed.

On the part of some who deny the applicability of such portions of Scripture to sinners after baptism, it has been declared with some solicitude, that they do not therefore mean to deny that such persons will be forgiven upon sincere repentance.† That on the contrary

they feel assured of the efficacy of *sincere repentance*, even in the case of “the most presumptuous and grievous sins.” But this gives rise to the question, what right have they to entertain such confidence? Upon what *Scriptural* grounds does it rest? I believe that if they consider the question, they will be obliged to acknowledge that they have no grounds in Scripture for feeling thus assured that grievous sin after baptism will be forgiven upon sincere repentance, except those very passages of Scripture which promise forgiveness to *ALL repentant sinners*, that is, the very passages which they have refused to apply to sinners after baptism. I believe that to vindicate their confidence that these sinners will be forgiven if they repent, they must come back to the very passages which they denied to be applicable to the case of such sinners!

But it will be said perhaps, that, though it is said that these passages do not apply to sinners after baptism, yet what is really meant is, that they do not apply in the same way and sense to sinners before and after baptism. And that, in particular, *repentance* in the case of the latter includes *discipline*, that is to say, *penance*, inflicted by the authority of the Church. This seems, in substance, the modification of Dr. Pusey's view of sin after baptism, which was proposed by Mr. Wordsworth (in the sermon referred to, p. 96, note) and apparently adopted by Dr. Pusey as a necessary mitigation of his doctrine as originally proposed. Dr. P. had laid down (as stated in the charge,) that no

he goes on sinning still again and again, can be sincere in his profession;—a point which has evidently nothing to do with the question, whether if he were sincere in his profession, his *state of mind* ought to be called repentance or not. The other is from *Hermas*, who tells his celestial guide, that he has heard that when a man once has become a believer, he thenceforth has no more *repentance* for his sins: ‘*Et ait mihi: Recte audisti. . . . Qui enim jam crediderunt, aut qui credituri sunt, penitentiam peccatorum non habent, sed remissionem.*’ I do not know what value will be assigned to these passages by any readers, but I suppose there are none who would not feel that to justify his hesitation to give the name of *repentance* to a state of mind which has all the characteristics of what *SCRIPTURE* calls *repentance*, the writer should have had something, which at least he regarded as *scriptural* authority for his scruples. And moreover, most persons would require that there should be some scriptural authority for the further point, that though these scruples be well founded, and though therefore the name of repentance cannot be properly bestowed upon any state of mind of a sinner after baptism, he may yet be saved. For one who has learned from Scripture that it is only through repentance that a sinner can escape the wages of sin, will hardly be convinced that those who fall into sin after baptism cannot repent, but may obtain forgiveness, by being told that *Epiphanius* says that they cannot have *μετάνοια*, but that the church allows to them an *ἐπαύρις* [through *μεταμέλεια*; and that *Hermas* says, (whatever he means thereby,) that though they cannot have, *penitentia*, they may have *remissio*: and that Mr. Wordsworth himself does not for a moment doubt the efficacy of what he yet hesitates to call *repentance*.

\* i. e. Considering only sin and its natural effect in hardening the heart, and rendering sinners impenitent, just in the degree which it is heinous, and not considering the power of the SPIRIT in the Christian Church, to restore as well as to sustain; or the advocacy of Him who is the propitiation of our sins, and our advocate with the Father when we sin.

† This is Mr. Wordsworth's declaration upon the point. ‘My brethren, let me not be understood for a moment to doubt the efficacy of sincere repentance, (so to call it,) in the case even of the most grievous and presumptuous sins.’—*Sermon*, p. 20. In a note he gives the reason for the qualifying parenthesis ‘(so to call it).’ ‘*Epiphanius* (Adv. Hær. lix. Sect. 1.) declines to call it by the same name, even when he is arguing against the Cathari. Καὶ ἂν μὲν τέλει μετάνοια ἐν λουτρῷ τοῦ ἁγίου εἰ δέ τις παρῆγεν, οὐκ ἀλλήλους τοῦτον ἢ ἄρα τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἑκκλησίᾳ δίδωσι γὰρ τὴν ἐπαύριον καὶ μετὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν τὴν μεταμέλειαν. [Mr. W.'s opinion of this distinction, was earlier in his sermon, given in such terms as would have made it very unlikely that he was so soon to avail himself of it. μετάνοια, μετάνοια μεταμέλεια (μεταμέλεια.) Critics have attempted to draw distinctions between the meaning of the two words, but, apparently, on insufficient grounds.]’

Besides this, in vindication of the doubt whether what the author so earnestly declares that he believes to be efficacious, in the case even of the most grievous and presumptuous sins, ought to be called repentance or not, he gives two other extracts. One is from *Clement of Alexandria*, who says, that often to ask pardon for offences often repeated, is not μετάνοια but δέκσις μετάνοια;—which is only expressing a natural doubt whether a man who goes on professing to repent, while



one who had fallen after baptism into grievous sin, could arrive at any happy confidence of his forgiveness; that there are but two periods of plenary cleansing made known to us in the Bible,—baptism and the day of judgment. One of these is passed with the sinners in question, who have therefore doomed themselves to uncertainty about their state before God, which there are no means of removing until the second period arrives. From this view of the gospel,—which would brand as presumption and delusion, the peace and hope, and joy in believing, that in life and in death had been the portion of those members of the Church who had been brought by God's grace from sin to holiness, and from practical unbelief to true faith;—which would banish peace from the hearts of such a vast majority, to say the very least, of God's children, with whose spirit His Spirit is bearing witness that they are his children, and enabling them by their outward walk to approve themselves to others as His children;—and which would paralyze the *ministry of reconciliation* in the Church,—there was, as might have been hoped, a very general recoil: and it was not merely very generally rejected, but reasoned against very strongly. And though Dr. Pusey professes that nothing that was said upon the question had changed his own mind as to the substance of what he had put forward, he seems glad to receive this modification of his statements, and to acknowledge it as supplying an imperfection with which they were chargeable. The view is, in substance, that in using *repentance* so as to 'cover the commission even of deadly sin, we are *extending* the application of the word, in a way which *it is possible* to find passages in the New Testament to justify, but that to make the application safe, we must extend the *meaning* as well as the *use* of the word, and that it ought in such cases to be understood to include, over and above the state of mind, for which it usually stands, (together with the natural results in the feelings and in the life of the penitent,) such penitential discipline as is appointed by the Church, ending with absolution by her authority. This Mr. W. pronounces to be proved both by 'the testimony of scripture, and the practice of the primitive Church' to be '*the safe and divinely-appointed way for the recovery of fallen Christians.*'

Now the question is not about the power of the Church to inflict censure up to actual exclusion from her pale, upon open offenders; and to prescribe rules for the removal of her censures, including the requirement of such proofs of repentance as she deems best fitted to secure and promote repentance in the offender, and to prevent sin in others. Nor about the wholesomeness of such discipline, for restraint, and edification, when exercised wisely and on scriptural principles—nor on the fitness of submitting to all the godly ordinances of the Church in this matter, and the proof that a man would give of some defect in the genuineness of his repentance if he were to reject her authority, and refuse to submit to her ordinances. No question is raised about any of these points. The ques-

tion is entirely about the divine appointments for the forgiveness of sin. And it must be plain, I think, that when it is maintained that *repentance* as applied to sinners after baptism, has a different sense from that in which it is applied to them before, there ought to be some proof of the assertion *from scripture*. It cannot be alleged that there are two different forms of invitation and promise to repentant sinners; one for those who are outside the Church, and the other for those who are within it. What must be maintained, therefore, by those who will not take the alternative of denying that there are any promises at all in Scripture of the forgiveness of sinners after baptism, is: that where promises identically the same are made to sinners without and within the Church, if they *repent*; this last important word is to be taken in different senses according to the persons to whom it is addressed; that, *if they repent*, means in the one case simply if they undergo a change of mind with respect to sin, so as to be sorry for the sin which they have committed, to turn from it, forsake, and hate it, and whatever else may be comprehended in the ordinary meaning of the words; and, *if they repent*, means, in the other case, if, in addition to such a change of feelings, they undergo penance, and receive absolution.

Now it might be rash to say that it is impossible that this statement can be true, but it plainly requires very good proof. Mr. Wordsworth, however, does not profess to be able to provide such a proof: on the contrary, he says, that it is a point which 'it is not perhaps very easy to determine'—'I mean of course, out of scripture itself.'—p. 14. I presume that the texts which are adduced in such numbers through the afterpages of his discourse, are intended to do something towards the determination of the point out of scripture, but how they do so I am quite unable to see. For they consist chiefly of evidences of the high standard of morals which was established in the Christian Church by the exhortations, and the precepts, and the rebukes, and the warnings, which abound in the epistles; very important portions of Holy Scripture, no doubt, but having but little bearing on the question: does *repentance*, when applied to sinners within the Church, include *penance* or not? The writer urges that the apostles, when rebuking sin, or deterring men from sin, by declaring God's righteous sentence upon it, were but little in the habit of qualifying the force of what they said by bringing forward examples of God's mercy to repentant sinners under the old dispensation, or during the ministry of the Lord. But here again, whatever be the importance of the point, it has no application to the question whether *repentance* involves *penance*, when the sinner is a member of the Christian Church. And the same is to be said of other passages which declare that the guilt of sinners is in proportion to the light bestowed upon them, and that the same will be the measure of their condemnation.

It may be said that the text to which I refer



are not brought in proof of this point, but to illustrate other points connected with the subject. It may be so. I really do not know. But this I am sure of, that if what I have referred to, be not the proof from scripture of this position concerning the third meaning of *repentance*, I can find no attempt in the sermon to furnish any scriptural evidence of the assertion. Be this as it may, however, I do not think there would be any profit (even if space could be commanded for it) in entering into a detailed examination of this portion of the discourse, and I shall, instead, endeavour to settle the question in a more compendious and direct, and, what I hope will prove, a more satisfactory mode.

I shall give a few texts to show the following important points: 1. That the Apostolic epistles contemplate the fact, not merely that there should be some in the Christian Church unreconciled to God, but some who should prove by their outward life and conversation, that they were not in a state of reconciliation with Him. And, 2. That the *reconciliation* of such to God, or their *conversion*, was to be the object of the labours of God's ambassadors; and that this was to be done by bringing them to repentance, and by exhibiting to them the love of God in the gift of Christ as the true ground of faith in Him;—in short, that for them the *ministry of reconciliation* was to be executed in the same way as that by which those that were without were to be brought to repent and to believe the gospel. I expect that the settlement of this question will be found to be contained in the right explanation and application of the few texts which are necessary to prove these positions.

1. To begin with the Corinthians. They were, I need not say, baptized members of the Christian Church; the Apostle addresses them, in fact, as a body, as *saints; as washed, sanctified, justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God*. But there were not merely divisions and irregularities in the body, but he had reason to fear of many, that they had committed gross and grievous sins, and were untouched by remorse or shame. This appears in a passage (2 Cor. xii. 20) to which I shall return immediately; for the present I only want to show how he exercised his office towards them. Did he denounce them as hopelessly fallen from God, or proclaim against them the sentence of His just wrath and indignation against sin, without holding out any hopes to them from the mercy which they had enjoyed and abused? Such, according to Mr. Wordsworth's theory, should have been the Apostle's mode of dealing with such offenders. Now, see what was the actual mode. Look at 2 Cor. v. 18—21, where he declares to them, that he and his brethren were intrusted with the ministry of reconciliation, and further declares that its foundation was in the love of God in the reconciling work of Christ in the flesh: and having thus stated his commission, he proceeds to execute it, for those to whom he was writing, with such persuasive earnestness in the well-known passage:—"Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as

though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God*. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

2. The passage just referred to as evidence of the extent to which gross sin existed in the Church at Corinth, is also of much importance on the question of the place of repentance allowed to such sinners. It is: "But I fear lest when I come I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not: lest there be debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults: and lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness, which they have committed." Now, if the Apostle had stopped short at his enumeration of the disorders and evil tempers which he feared he should find at Corinth, the passage would create less difficulty upon the principles which we have been considering; which, among their other evil effects, have a tendency to set too wide a distance between such sins and grosser profligacy. This is not an unnatural result of identifying too much the objects and effects of Church discipline, with the peculiar government of His Church, which is carried on by Him, *who trieth the hearts and the reins, and who requireth truth in the inward parts*. It is, however, not only discontinued by the whole tenor of the word of God, but it receives a very special contradiction from St. Paul's recital of "the works of the flesh." (Gal. v. 19—21), in which "hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, envyings," are enumerated together with "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, murders, drunkenness, revellings,"—are all comprehended in the same class, and all involved in the same solemn condemnation, "that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." But though I am glad to glance at this point, I am not sorry to be spared the necessity of discussing it regularly, which would occupy an inconvenient space. And the character of the sins which are added to the list, admits of too little dispute to make it necessary to say more on the former. For he adds, that *uncleanness and fornication, and lasciviousness*, had also been committed by many.\* And with respect to these gross and grievous sinners, what the Apostle feared

\* When St. James, in the course of his indignant and sorrowful reproof of those who were disgracing the Church in his day, addresses them or some of them, as *adulterers and adulteresses*, it is said that 'the expression is to be understood "sensu figurato." See Grotius and Hammond in loc.'—Wordsworth Sermon, p. 23, Note. I suppose there is no danger of a similar gloss upon St. Paul's designation of the sins of the Corinthians of whom he speaks, but it may not be amiss to guard it by this ancient exposition of its meaning: ἀκαθαρσίαν δὲ πᾶσαν ἀναρτίαν νοήσεις· πᾶσα γὰρ ἀκαθάρτου ποιεῖ ἡδίκησε τὰς τῶν σωματικῶν μέλειν ἀρρεπτοίας· ὡς γὰρ εἰς ἡν ὁ πορνέσας ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς εἰδὲσιν ἀσελγῶν.—Theophylact. in loc.



was, lest he should find that they *had not repented*. He dreaded lest God had sorrow and shame in store for him, on account of those in whom he took so deep and tender an interest. But, mark, what he dreaded was,—not that he should find that there were some among them who had been guilty of these gross and grievous sins,—of that he seems to have had a sorrowful assurance,—but lest he should find that they had not *repented*. “For I fear, lest when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I be found unto you such as ye would not: lest there be debates. . . . And lest when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness, which they have committed.” Mr. Wordsworth would wish, after some eminent commentators, that instead of *I shall bewail*, we should render the word, *I shall be forced to punish*. Suppose we do, what then? Why, then, we have in the passage ‘a proof of penitential discipline.’ No doubt; but in a shape very contrary indeed to his theory. For, it appears, that the repentance even of these very gross offenders would have suspended the penal exercise of the Apostle’s authority. If he found them exhibiting a hardy impenitance, he would be *forced to punish* them, but if they had repented, his fears of this painful necessity were at an end. So that, whether we understand him to express his fears, that he would have to *sorrow over*, or that would be *forced to inflict punishment on*, these sinners, the lesson which the passage teaches us, as to the light in which he regarded *repentance*, is the same. He dreaded that he would have to punish them, or to mourn over them: but it was not, because he feared to find that they had thus grossly sinned, but that having so sinned they had not *repented*.

3. But we have not done with the Corinthians yet. It will be remembered that St. Paul rebukes them with much severity in his first Epistle, and that in his second, having heard of their sincere repentance in the interval, he is anxious to assure them of his full satisfaction at their return to a sense of duty,—of his forgiveness and love. Here is what Mr. Wordsworth says, in connexion with this portion of the Epistle; it seems a useful illustration of the mode of using Scripture, to which I have before directed attention: ‘In like manner the repentance which St. Paul describes as that of his Corinthian converts, with all its true and lively characteristics, what were the circumstances of the case out of which it arose? Not an act of guilt, much less a course of abandoned life; but an omission of duty; the neglecting to *put away from among them that wicked person*.” p. 7. Repentance might serve, it would seem, in the case of such an *omission of duty*, but we have no right to infer that it would have been enough, even though proved to be genuine by being attended with *all its true and lively characteristics*, if they had been chargeable with an *act of guilt, much more with a course of abandoned life*. Very well. But is it not strange that the consideration of this case did not

bring to Mr. Wordsworth’s mind the case of *that wicked person* himself, concerning whom they were guilty of this act of omission? He was guilty of *fornication, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles*; and, living in this ‘course of abandoned life,’ he was cut off from the Church by the command of the Apostle. And yet upon learning that this man manifested deep sorrow for his sin, the same Apostle ordered him *at once* to be restored. And, apparently apprehending that the Corinthians might be slow to forgive and receive him again,—that they might think that one, who had sinned so grievously, and brought upon them such heavy scandal, and the weight too of his own severe displeasure, ought to be punished by still longer exclusion from the body,—the holy Apostle (besides assuring them that he had entirely forgiven them, and that he was perfectly happy in them once more) tells them that the offender had endured enough in having had public sentence passed upon him for his sin; and that now they ought to be chiefly anxious lest he should suffer too much through the bitterness of his repentance, and that they ought, therefore, not merely to forgive him, but comfort him: “Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him and comfort him, lest, perhaps, such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore, I beseech you, that ye would confirm your love toward him. (2 Cor. ii. 6—8.)

I cannot refrain from adding what follows in Mr. Wordsworth’s Sermon. Though it is not connected with the case of the Corinthians, it is with the use of Scripture in support of the theology of the Tract school,—with which it is impossible not to class Mr. Wordsworth’s Sermon, whatever be his connexion personally with the writers. It is, I think, not less worthy of notice than any of the strange examples which I have already given. It stands in immediate connexion with the last extract upon the offence of the Corinthians: ‘And so perhaps, though in an aggravated degree, the sin of Simon Magus. That of which he had need to repent was a thought of the heart; and, as such, was to be met with spiritual exercise. “Pray God,” says St. Peter, “*if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee*.”’

I hope there are not many of my readers who are not startled at this flagrant perversion of Scripture, and at the habit of unconsciously perverting Scripture which it exhibits. When a man has formed habits of dealing with the word of God, which allow him to draw from the narrative in Acts viii. that Simon Magus had no *deadly sin* to repent of, but only a *thought of the heart*, because St. Peter says, “Pray God if perhaps the *thought of thine heart* may be forgiven thee,”—I know nothing to prevent him, if the exigencies of his theory equally required him to extenuate their guilt, from settling, that the Scribes in Mark ii. 22–30, were guilty of no *deadly sin*, but only an *offence of the tongue*, because the Evangelist says, in explaining in what their crime consisted, “Because *they said*, that he had an unclean Spirit;” It may be thought that this



is an exaggerated and absurd aggravation of the abuse of Scriptural language, of which Mr. Wordsworth is really guilty. For that in this latter case there is full security against such a mistake concerning the sin of the Scribes as I have imagined; because the Evangelist informs us just before, that the Lord describes it as blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and declares, that it shall never be forgiven. I have no doubt that this ought to be a perfect safeguard. But how can we be sure that it would prove one? For, in the case of Simon Magus, the sacred narrative tells us, that Peter pronounced him in the *gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity, and that his heart was not right in the sight of God*, and declared accordingly, that *he had neither part nor lot in the matter*. I do not profess to know precisely what it is that would be said to constitute "deadly" sin by those who insist a good deal upon the distinction in this very matter; but whether we look to this description of the nature of Simon's sin, or of its effects on his state before God, I can hardly think that it will be held that it describes a 'venial' sin.

4. There are very strong statements in the Epistle of St. James of the extent of disorder and vice which were to be found in the Church in his time. The concluding verses of his Epistle, however, appear equally strong and distinct, upon some of the points which are brought into question, in this theory of Sin after Baptism, and the modification of it, which we have been considering. "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." v. 20, 21. The language here is very marked, and confirms what I said of the exercise of the ministry of reconciliation within the Church, in speaking on 2 Cor. v. 19-21.

5. There are some remarkable invitations to repent, (which I presume must always be understood as promises to repentance,) in the Epistles to the Churches in the beginning of Revelations. Mr. Wordsworth notices several, which he does not think come up to what is wanted to make them instances of the use of repentance in what he calls its *extended* sense. Referring to such exhortations in Rev. iii. 2, 3, in the Epistle to Sardis; Rev. iii. 19 to Laodicea; Rev. ii. 2-5 to Ephesus, he says:—"And in each of these places it is important to remark, that the rebuke (it would seem) is not for relapses into deadly sin, in the case of individuals, but for laxity of discipline, as that whereof the whole body had to repent: or as regarded individual members, for luke-warmness, for want of zeal, for not going on unto perfection, for not bringing forth the *meet fruits* of that change of mind, unto which they had been baptized."\* I will not stop to examine the correctness of this statement, but be content with suggesting that I think what is said in the case of Sardis, would admit of some addition to it. But what follows is much more important. Of three instances which Mr. Wordsworth gives of the

passages in the New Testament, which it is possible to find as warranting such an extension of the application of the word, two are from this part of Revelations. They are given thus: "Such *it may be* is the censure, addressed in Revelations to the Church in Pergamos," p. 12. And in a note it is added: "And perhaps also to the Church of Thyatira; or, at least the statement (Rev. ii. 21, 22.) with respect to certain corrupt teachers in the Church." I shall transcribe the last of these passages, and, I believe, most readers will be of opinion that it might have been given (as Hooker says) "without any peradventure." It refers to the woman Jezebel, who pretended to be a prophetess and taught and seduced Christ's servant's to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. And of whom, notwithstanding this enormous wickedness, it is still said, "*And I gave her space to repent of her fornication, and she repented not.*" And then, both of her and of those whom she had led into a participation in her iniquity, it is added, "Behold I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her, into great tribulation, *except they repent of their deeds.*"

7. I will give but one text more, viz. Rev. iii. 20, in which the Lord describes himself with such tender condescension, not merely as ready to receive penitents who turn to him, but as seeking them anxiously, patiently waiting for their better mind, and sealing their acceptance and restoration by unquestionable proofs of confidence and affection. "Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

Mr. Wordsworth acknowledges distinctly that this is a strong text, but he gives a very curious, though brief comment on it, which seems intended to abate its force. "Perhaps after all, the most conclusive texts [in support of the XVIth Article] are James v. 20. [noticed above, No. 4.] . . . and Rev. iii. 20. (but see Grotius's Note, and observe in original the tenses, ἵστηκα, ἀκούσθι, ἀνοίξτε,) . . ." I must acknowledge myself unable to understand what is intended by this recommendation. The point contended for in Mr. W.'s Sermon would seem to make the meaning of it clear enough. But such a meaning can only be arrived at through a sort of criticism which it is hardly justifiable to ascribe to him. I find indeed in Hammond's marginal note on, *I stand*, in our version: "*I have stood, ἵστηκα.*" But Mr. W. cannot mean to counterpoint this curious emendation. It would be uncivil to any ordinary scholar, much more to one in his position, to suspect him of doubting that the proper sense of ἵστηκα (when used intransitively), is *I stand*. And indeed it is nearly as hard to suppose that he meant to intimate that ἀκούσθι, and ἀνοίξτε, retain the *time* which their tense in the *indicative* expresses. But then what is the meaning of recommending his readers to observe the tenses of ἵστηκα. That, as I before said, I am absolutely unable even to conjecture.

I shall leave these examples to the consideration of my readers. But I am constrained to extend this note, which I should be much more desirous to abridge if I could, by turning

\* Sermon, p. 5.

back to Mr. Wordsworth's plea for translating *πενήτω*, *I shall be forced to punish*, which I passed over at the time. He desires us to consider amongst other things in the text, "the proof of penitential discipline implied in the word *πενήτω*, ('punire cogar' Grot.; see Hammond on 1 Cor. v. 2), and also in *ταπεινωσι*. Comp. *ibid.* xiii. 2. *ὁ ψίτοςμα*."

I have said that I do not think the question which this raises, affects the use which I have made of the passage, but it is a specimen of biblical criticism which I cannot feel it right to pass over when it is brought directly in my way. It is far from being as unimportant a matter as it might be hastily regarded. It is part of a general reverence for the Holy Scripture, as well as of a prudent guardianship of a sound interpretation of it, not to let a *word* of a particular text be loosely turned from its proper meaning, under the notion that, whether it be or not, the meaning drawn from the passage is one which is true in itself, or which is a safe meaning, or even, in effect, not very different from the meaning which it would have, if we were to give another sense to the particular word in question. What we ought to aim at, is to get the exact meaning of the passage, so far as we can; and both for this purpose and for the general reasons before referred to, we cannot be too watchful against any loose or false verbal criticism.

The original author of the interpretation seems to be Grotius. In his note on 1 Cor. v. 2, he says:—"Est metonymia adjuncti. Nam quia ecclesia, cum aliquem esset a suo consorcio exclusura, lugentium sumebat habitum, eò factum ut *lugere* dicatur pro *excommunicare*. Sic *πενήσω* (*lugebo*) interpretatur veteres." And, in proof of this assertion, he quotes 'Clement. Const. ii. [c. 41], Tertulian de Pudicitia. Orig. cont. Cels. iii., Episcopi Synod. Eph. ad Eccles. Constant. narrantes depositionem Nestorii. Sic etiam Theodoretus Sermone duodecimo adv. Græcos.' Now in not one of these places, I will venture to say, is there any ground for supposing any *metonymy*, as regards the words referred to. Indeed, how Grotius could have imagined it to exist in any of the four first quotations, I am at a loss to conjecture; for it seems plain, that in all, the words expressing *grief* or *sorrow* are used in their proper sense, to describe the natural emotions felt by those who are constrained to cast offenders out of the Church. And, in fact, they offer no more even apparent foundation for Grotius's asserted metonymy than an account of a judge's having shed tears in passing sentence upon a criminal, would give for asserting, that, by a common metonymy, in legal parlance, *to weep* stood for *to pass sentence*.

It gives a strange impression of the very loose mode of considering the subject with which this eminent critic was satisfied, that when he comes to 2 Cor. xii. 21, the metonymy is so different, while he evidently regards it as the same: Est hic *μεταωνυμία* [Transnominatio] Nam *lugeam* dicit pro *punire cogar*, quod Apostoli non faciebant sine signis. Sic ut Romani civem damnaturum sumebant pullam togam. De hoc sensu vide quæ dicta 1 Cor. v. 2. I suppose it is unnecessary to

say, that converting *I shall bewail*, into: *I shall excommunicate* and into; *I shall be forced to punish*, (even if *to punish*, mean to *excommunicate*) are somewhat different.

He has been followed, however, in this latter metonymy by some respectable authorities, but so far as I can see without adding any thing beyond the weight of their names to his very bad reasons for adopting it. Hammond not merely adopts it, but runs wild upon it. Insomuch that it would appear he hardly thought it possible for the apostle to be sorry for any thing, but being about to pass sentence of excommunication, or having passed it; and that no touch of sorrow could come upon anybody else, except for having undergone such a sentence. But even this fails to give a full idea of the way in which he carries out this metonymy, which indeed can only be adequately conceived by letting him speak for himself. After giving some of the same quotations as those brought forward by Grotius, he says, "and so 2 Cor. xii. 21, *καὶ πενήσω*, &c., where, *bewailing of impenitent sinners is censuring them*. And thus the word *λύπη* seems to signify (being all one with *πένθος*) 2 Cor. ii. 1. *ἐλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ to come with intention to censure and punish* . . . . so *λυπην ἔχω* signifies *to be constrained to use severity of censures*, to which this mourning or sorrow belongs, and *λυπείσθαι to be under those censures*; and, *λυπεῖν to offend and commit* that which St. Paul was constrained to punish with the censures of the Church; so chapter vii. 8, *εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς*, is, *if I inflicted the censures of the Church upon you*; and in the end of the verse, I see that that Epistle, though written for that season, *ἐλύπησεν ὑμᾶς, brought the censures of the Church upon you*: 9. *καὶ οὐκ ἔτι ἐλυπήθητε, that ye were put under the censures, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*, but those censures produced that effectual change in you, *ἐλυπήθητε γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν*, for ye were dealt with according to the scripture ordained by God, or Christ, in the Church: and so in all probability that is *λύπη κατὰ Θεὸν* vs. 10, which brings *μετάνοιαν*, a change, or newness of life, as the censures or punishments of the world bring death. And so, *κατὰ Θεὸν λυπηθήναι ὑμᾶς to be mourned or sorrowed*, vs. 11, that is, *censured according to God's appointment*, in 1 Cor. v. 2." I suppose it is enough to have exhibited such an extraordinary commentary, without entering upon any detailed examination of it. And it is much pleasanter to be spared such an occupation. For it would be very hard to speak of it according to its merit, without running the risk of appearing wanting in due respect for the venerable commentator.

The truth appears to be that St. Paul did anticipate that the necessity of dealing harshly with these offenders would be put upon him. And that the sorrow which he dreaded as in store for him, would find a cause in what he feared he would be obliged to do to these men, as well as in the state of impenitence in which he was likely to find them, cannot be reasonably doubted. But this is quite a distinct thing from saying that *πενήσω* signifies *excommunicate*; or *to punish*; or *to be forced to punish*; or that *λυπέω* means, *to offend*, and *commit* that which would constrain the proper authorities *to punish one with the censures of*



the church;—or any of these various meanings which have been proposed so wantonly, and with such strange confusion of ideas, and with so little show of authority. I am aware how far it would be from settling the question, if I were to say that I have never met with any example of a use of *πενθω*, which could fairly suggest any of these meanings. But then, what is much more important, I find that the highest authorities are in the same circumstances. Stephens takes no notice of any such sense; nor does Passow; from which it may be fairly concluded at least, that there is no example of it in classical Greek. It is recognized, it is true, by New Testament lexicographers. Thus Schleusner has: *reddo aliquem tristem, officio ut aliquis mereat et contristetur, et ex adjuncto: gravissime punio*. But, however valuable his Lexicon is in other respects, it is singularly loose in definition, and he continually commits the fault, (which is so destructive of anything like an exact conception of the meaning of words,) of introducing into the definition of a word something which is connected with it as the effect, concomitant or something of that kind, of what it really expresses. He gives no authorities for this sense; and only refers to the passage under consideration in the epistle to the Corinthians, so that it is not unfair to conclude, that his only ground for it may be, what is to be found in Grotius on the subject.

In Rose's Edition of Parkhurst, after the ordinary meaning, it is said, 'but Wahl says, *officio dolore*.' If he had said so, though I must confess I do not know him so well as Schleusner, (or perhaps because I do not) I should be more inclined to think that there was some ground for it. What he does say however is different, and does not by any means give the weight of his authority, whatever it be, to this meaning: it is "Pro: *habeo quod lugeam*. 2 Cor. xii. 21. Alii pro: *officio dolore*."

How very little countenance this violence to the natural meaning of the word receives from ancient commentators, is particularly striking, because they adopt the view, which I have already said I think is a natural one, that when St. Paul speaks of the sorrow which he dreads, he was contemplating the necessity of punishing these offenders, as well as the impenitence which was to wring this punishment from him. But it does not seem to occur to them to regard *πενθω* or any of the equivalent or kindred words as used in any new or metaphorical sense, but simply as expressing the grief which the apostle anticipated as in store for him at Corinth. The following is from Theophylact, after Chrysostom,—*ἐὰν τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὅλου σπλάγχνα, πῶς ὑπερῶν ἄλλοι πταίονσι πένθῃ. Οὐκ εἴτε δὲ, παντὰς ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς: καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότες, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετανοήσαντας ὅσοι γὰρ ἔτι πένθουσιν, οἱ ἐν τῷ πρᾶγματι μένοντες. Καὶ οὐδὲ σούτους ἐκκαλεῖται δι' ἰδούς αὐτοὺς βαλῆσαν τὴν πρὸς μετάνοιαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν. Καὶ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ μετάνοιαν ἐκινῶσθαι ἵνα ὀρθώσασιν ταύτην, καὶ μὴ ἐλθὼν κολᾶσθαι αὐτούς, καὶ πειθισθὲν διὰ τοῦτο, ὅ ἐστι, τὰ ἔσχατα λυπηθῇ. Σημειώσαι δὲ τὸ περὶ μετάνοιαν διὰ τοὺς Ναυατιανούς.\**

\* Eusebiius gives this rather more dramatically. Upon καὶ μετ' αὐτοὺς ἐπ' αὐτὸν, he says, πῶς εἰσὶν οἱ Ναυατιανοί;

The concluding sentence of the commentary, in which St. Paul's description of the sins of the Corinthians is explained, has been already quoted at p. 77, and need not be added here. But I need hardly call attention to the marked confirmation which the foregoing gives to the view that I have taken of the force of the passage, as a testimony to the efficacy of repentance, even for such gross sins. Indeed Chrysostom not only says, as Theophylact does above, that the Apostle in speaking of these sinners concealed their names with the express purpose of making their return to repentance easy, but he adds, καὶ δὴλον ποιεῖν, ὅτι δίδεται μετάνοια τὰ πεπληρωμένα διορθῶσαι.

Upon *ἐπενθῆσατε* in 1 Cor. v. 2. it is said in Theophylact: *ἔδει εὐρασθαι καὶ κλῆσαι, ὥς ἐπὶ νόσου καὶ λοιμοῦ ἵνα ἐξαρῇ.* But Theodoret is curiously express upon this point. For he not only notices the word *ἐπενθῆσατε*, and explains it by *ἐβρίσατε*, but he actually says that the Apostle could not have taken them to task for not *excommunicating* the offender, without being guilty of inconsistency. Whether he is right or wrong in this point, it is equally plain how little he suspected that St. Paul was doing this very thing by a *metonymy*, as Grotius asserts:—*οὐκ ἐναντία νομοθετεῖ οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, τί δὴ ποτε οὐκ ἐβρίσασατε; ἀπηγόρευσε γὰρ ἀνα το κέλειν, τοῖς διασκέλοις: ἀλλὰ τίνος χάριν οὐκ ἐβρίσασα, γον θεῶν ἐκετεῖσθες ὥστε τῆς τούτου λύσεως ἀπαλλαγῆναι.*

Note B. page 45, line 29, second column.

(Reference accidentally omitted.)

Of these Apologists, the most skilful and effective was the author of an article in the Quarterly Review for March 1839, on *Oxford Theology*. It was an analysis and defence of the teaching of the Tractarian school up to that time, which brought their cause very advantageously before a large class of readers, comprehended in the extensive circulation of the Review. There were, of course, very many who felt that obtaining an acquaintance for themselves with *Oxford Theology* was altogether out of the question, and who yet naturally wished to know what they ought to think and say about what was every where talked of. This rather numerous class must have been not a little gratified at being supplied so compendiously and pleasantly with all that they wanted. The writer reviewed regularly, and refuted, all the popular charges against the Tractarians, and showed that they were all founded upon a partial acquaintance with their principles, or an ignorance of the principles of our Church: For that there was nothing objected to as erroneous or dangerous in any part of their teaching, which was not corrected or counteracted in some other part; or was not supported fully by the authority of our standard divines.

One of the points to which the author specially addressed himself, was the supposed leaning of the Tractarians to Rome, and the supposed tendency of their theology to strengthen her cause in this country. Upon this point he is triumphant. He has quotations which 'set the matter at rest,' and so completely, that he feels able to be facetious



on the charge, and pleasantly remarks, 'Now this is rather strong language to be used by a reviver of Popery; we scarcely think it would dispose the Pope to receive his expected proselytes favourably.'—p. 551. And again, in the same jocular vein, as it would seem: 'The public may be assured that the University of Oxford is perfectly clear of Jesuits. It is carrying on no correspondence with papal emissaries; it is planning no innovation in the Church.'—p. 542. His graver sentence upon the imputation is, 'As to the idle notions of there being anything in the system before us to encourage Popery, all sensible persons will agree with Professor Powell\* in rejecting them as flowing either from 'ignorance of the question,' or disregard of distinct disavowals.'—p. 556.

The author was eloquent and dexterous; and sustained all his points by references at once so exact and so copious as to show how needless it was to revise his defence, and how very troublesome it would be to do so. It was not to be wondered that so many acquiesced in the article, as a perfectly satisfactory proof that the alarm which was felt about the tendencies of this theology, was altogether groundless and unreasonable. And this was actually its effect in a wide circle. It did a great deal, (few publications so much,) to allay suspicion, and disarm prejudice, to write up the Tracts and Tractarians, and to bring all opposition to them into disrepute.

But time, though it opens the eyes of some very slowly, opens all at last, *ῥίθιν δὲ τὴν ῥίπιν ἐλπίδα*. In March 1842, just three years after this article was published, another article appeared in the same journal, apparently by the same writer, which showed that he at least had at length become alive to some of the dangers which he had thought others so unreasonable, and even ridiculous, in apprehending. The article is *on the Church of England Divines of the seventeenth century*. The writer regards these divines as undeniably the proper authorities to be appealed to, when the principles of our Church are at all the matter in question. And in the style which made his former article so effective—never making an assertion without appearing to prove it on the spot by reference to his authorities—he proceeds to show from the writings of these illustrious men, that, upon the character of the Church of Rome, and our relation to her;—upon our own Church, her character, and her claims; the reverence, affection, and submission due to her;—upon the Reformation and the Reformers;—upon PROTESTANT, 'name and thing';—upon the way in which foreign Protestant bodies wanting the privilege and blessing of Episcopal government, are to be regarded and treated by us;—upon the unity of the Church, as consisting with the independence of National Churches;—upon the place and use of tradition; upon the relation of the Church and the State;—in short, upon many very leading

points in the controversy of the present day, the principles and feelings of these men (whom he and the Tractarians agree in regarding as the true court of appeal) are decidedly opposed to those which have been put forward in the writings of the Tractarian school. Of these writings, there is no express mention in the Article; and of course none of his former defence of them. But the reference to them is just as intelligible, and indeed as unequivocal, as if it were express. It was probably understood by the least informed readers of the Review. And there was no affectation of misunderstanding it on the part of those who were aimed at. A regular reply appeared from them in the October of the same year, in the *British Critic*, under the title of '*Development of the Church in the seventeenth century*,'—in which there is certainly no want of boldness or skill, and which must at least have satisfied their former advocate, that writing these men down, is not likely to be as smooth and grateful a task, as writing them up was. They refer directly to "the appearance of an article in the first and most influential periodical of the day. . . . having especial reference to the judgment of our 'divines of the seventeenth century,'" as the occasion of their review of the same distinguished authorities. They have no thought of objecting to the tribunal before which their opponent has brought their opinions. On the contrary, their anxiety seems to be to fix him, and others through him, to the judges whom he has chosen in the cause. They hail with joy his acknowledgment that the theology of these divines '*is the standard theology of the English Church*,' expecting that few will be found 'so hardy as to dispute the fact, after such an affirmation of it.' The reviewer, they say, has attempted to show that these great divines are against 'the Oxford writers' 'on the subject of Rome, Church and State, &c.' They propose to prove that he is greatly in error on this point. But they are first anxious that it should be remembered, that, were he ever so successful in proving what he attempts to prove, the relation of the Oxford Divines to the Divines of the seventeenth century, upon other points, would stand as it stood before;—that is, as they affirm, that in the views put forward in the Tracts and in other publications of their authors, on the more important doctrines of 'Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, Apostolical Succession, or points connected with them,' 'a perfect agreement exists between the former and the latter writers.\*' The only point at issue

\* Who is before courteously commended as 'a writer distinguished in physical science, and who candidly ridicules the notion of treating the new doctrine as Popery.' p. 542.

\* This they say has been irresistibly proved by 'Catena,' or quotations from our standard divines; and the same assertion is made upon all occasions, and often as if its truth were not denied by the opponents of the Tractarians. The fact however is, that it has not merely been denied, but most conclusively disproved. It has been shown that in the views which they have put forward upon all the above doctrines—at least upon points connected with all,—they not merely are not supported, but are strongly and decidedly opposed, by the most important authorities of the



is, whether there is a discrepancy between them on the other, and,—however important, still inferior points of,—how we ought to regard, speak of, and treat Rome on the one hand, and unepiscopal Protestantism on the other,—upon Papal supremacy—and other kindred questions. Upon these points, they expect that the appearance of discrepancy which their brother reviewer has exhibited

Catenæ. The useful work of revising these confident and imposing documents, was begun by Mr. Golightly, in the able, manly, and effective pamphlet which he published early in the controversy; it was continued by Bishop M'Ilvaine, and completed by Mr. Goode; until of all the authorities which they so confidently claimed, upon all their distinctive points, scarcely one has been left them of any real weight or importance. And yet, with what it is hard to style by any softer appellation than wonderful hardihood, they continue to speak not merely as if they still retained all these Divines, but as if they had been left in undisputed possession of them; not merely as if their opponents had not succeeded in wresting any of their boasted Compurgators from them, but as if they had never made the attempt! Considering that the following passage was written after the three works to which I have referred were published and very widely circulated, it must be felt to belong to the class which one must be content to call *unaccountable*.

'And since this is so, and one may claim without hesitation, (though setting up no one as a standard except the Church,) that our teaching is more in accordance with the acknowledged divines of the seventeenth century,—I would not exclude in this respect even those of the sixteenth,—than that which opposes it, one may on this ground the rather hope that what is thought defective in us, will not be so spoken against, as to seem to condemn our teaching in its substantial parts. They who brand us with the names of heresy, have, *through unacquaintances, doubtless, avoided this question, whether the chief divines of the seventeenth century are most with us, or with them.*'—Pusey's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 98.

However, though they are sure to return to this mode of treating the question, yet when the true state of the case is brought home to them on a particular occasion, they have another mode of dealing with it, of which I shall give a notable example in the words of another: "Finding that the Tractators founded their chief claim to public attention upon our standard divines, and had constructed several Catenas of extracts from them to support that claim, I took upon me to investigate those Catenas, and of one in particular, showed that all the best divines there quoted, instead of being in their favour, were altogether against them. The reply to me is, 'Were the author even to prove, (to put for argument's sake an extreme and most extravagant hypothesis) that ALL our standard writers since the Reformation were of his way of thinking, this would still be irrelevant as regards the Oxford opinions, not merely to the question of their truth, but even of their consistency with the formularies we have subscribed: WE ARE IN NO WAY CALLED THEN TO DISCUSS THE SUBJECT.' (Brit. Crit. of July 1842, p. 105.) Such is the reply of the Tractarians when convicted of a misrepresentation of our standard divines, such, as it might be supposed, any ingenuous mind would shrink from with horror. Well, what then? If they were all against us, it would be of no consequence. After this, the reader will know how to estimate a Tractarian 'Catena?.' Goode's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 12, note.

between them and those whom he and they acknowledge as the proper authorities, will vanish upon a closer and fairer view of the case;—which they accordingly proceed to give.

They maintain that the strongest language used by these divines against Popery, was either the result of recent suffering, or of some pressure actually felt, or apprehended from the circumstances of our own Church; but that even when they spoke most strongly, they did not pledge themselves against the papal theory, or against the system upon any but practical grounds. And to explain and enforce this, they call attention to the peculiar position of the Church after the Reformation, which forced her to take "a one-sided, or exclusively unfavourable view of the Roman Church,—into seeing only her corruption on the one hand, or her ambition on the other." And they maintain that her position is altogether different now, and that there can be no doubt, that were the same divines alive now, they would speak differently, and therefore, that living divines, if they will use their language under altered circumstances, have no right to plead their authority. So much they claim for the *position* of the Church, in abatement of the force of the strongest passages which have been quoted from those of our standard divines, who have written most strongly upon such points. But, moreover, they say, that there was a development in this respect, which not only corresponds with what this theory would require, but helps them still further; for, the farther that we recede from the Reformation, the more moderated do we find the tone of our divines with respect to Rome. They maintain that, in fact, there was a *constant movement* in the Church of England; that, as the earliest divines in the 17th century are distinguished from the Reformers, so are the later ones from *them*, until the 'rise of ecclesiastical tone in the Church, which Bancroft and Andrewes had already commenced, was developed and established by the Laudian episcopate.'

They give a series of extracts from the writings of the divines, whom they take as the representatives of the Church at the different periods, particularly the latter,—which they preface with the following distinct statement of what they intend that it shall prove against the Quarterly Reviewer, and for themselves: "Nor can there be any greater mistake than that of stringing all our divines together, without distinction or explanation—making them a mere printer's list, as if they were exactly alike—mere repetitions of each other, like so many bricks out of a kiln, or leaves out of the oven, or so much twist from the wheel, or cloth from the loom, or powder from the mill. A writer who so joins all schools together, and makes such a 'hotch-potch,' to use Bramhall's word, of our divines, must pardon us, if we cast a doubt upon the accuracy of his acquaintance with the times about which he has treated. There *are* distinctions amongst our divines; our Church divinity has been, as a matter of fact, a *progressive*, not a *stationary* one. The Laudian school was as clearly a *new development* of the Church, in its day, as



history can show it. And, be it well noted, it was a *successful* development—it *established* itself. Laud and his party were ‘innovators’ in their day; but how are they regarded now? As our greatest doctors, the highest standards and brightest ornaments of the Church. Turn to the pages of our contemporary—it is ‘*Laud and our soundest divines*’ throughout; and all his associates are quoted over and over and over again—Bramhall, Heylin, Forbes, Sanderson, Taylor, Hammond, Cosins, and the rest, as unexceptionable authorities, ‘whom all sides must be willing to acknowledge.’ The truth is, these divines, by a dint of immense effort, by a great and strong heave, lifted the Church above the levels of Calvinism, to a higher ground, and that ground has remained our *terra firma* to this day. . . . .

*The present orthodox divinity of our Church is a development since the Reformation, and a reaction upon it.* We care not how great innovators the school were considered in their time, or upon how slender a thread they seemed to hang; *they succeeded, and their innovation is now our rule. The Church cannot shake off the Laudian school.\** She has identified herself with them; she has accepted their ground; and she stands upon it.” pp. 344, 345. Not that they have any intention of suffering her to remain on this ground if they can help it. This would be making only a coarse and undiscerning use of the authorities to which they defer, which not merely establish their right to go thus far, but on the same principles, farther too. They boldly claim the right of following those whom the Quarterly Reviewer acknowledges to be safe guides. By appealing to ‘our divines of the seventeenth century’ generally, as the standard divines and true representatives of our Church, and, still more by his high and unqualified praise of those among them who carried this *development* farthest, the author must be understood to approve of it. The writer of the reply only claims, on the part of ‘the Oxford divines,’ to be allowed to carry it as much farther as the present circumstances of the Church and the world render necessary, and to have this necessity, and all that they do in obedience to it, judged of by the principles on which the past stages of the development are to be justified.

They give a great number of passages to show the nature and extent of this development. And, in conclusion they say, ‘Upon the plainest historical grounds then, supported by the testimony of popular opinion at the present day, we have the fact established of a change in our Church theology—a change since the Reformation—the development of a standard divinity in a later age, different from the standard divinity of a former. Calvin and his school, were the master spirits of the Reformation; they gave the impulse, and they left a stamp upon the movement which cannot be mistaken: let history for once be allowed to speak. The full development of Calvinism was stopped indeed, but only because the *Reformation itself* was stopped, and its peculiar doctrines remained the theology

of our Church *till Laud upset them.* . . . Let us hear no more of a full-born, settled, whole perfect system of Reformation divinity . . . uniform definitiveness, consistency of teaching, which has been so remarkable.’ Every one who knows the history of our Church knows that this is not the case; not only has her divinity altered, but her individual divines show signs of a change, and advance, as their inquiries proceeded—sometimes even in the course of the same work (*e. g.* Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity), showing clearly that their theology was just what it is asserted *not* to be, a *gradual formation*. Why carry on then a perfectionist language, which cannot be supported by fact? Why uphold a mere view, a pretty solacing theory, when the first breath of history must send our bandbox hypothesis to the winds? Why not confess? What harm can there be in acknowledging the truth, that ours was in spirit a Calvinistic Reformation, and that a noble episcopate afterwards reclaimed us? If the one fact be humiliating, the other is a counterbalance to it—and our Church between them both, would stand where she now stands. And can it be denied, that, as the Church threw off her Calvinism, she also began to incline to a union with Rome; *i. e.* if we are to take, as we must do, the Laudian school as the then representatives? But we will only proceed at present on the fact, that she did throw it off—that there has been a *change* in our theology since the Reformation. For if the precedent *has been set*, why may it not, with prudence and moderation, be *followed*? If our Church has changed her tone and language on various points, why may she not again, when circumstances demand—*i. e.* when the circumstances under which she spoke have themselves changed.” p. 385.

How the Quarterly Reviewer proposes to answer this question, or whether he proposes to answer it at all, we cannot know. But it brings very serious matter for consideration before him, and all who agree with him in taking ‘our divines of the seventeenth century,’ in the mass, as the true guides and representatives of the Church of England. Many have taken up his standard without examination, and without suspicion; and from the use which he was able to make of it, felt that we needed no more to restrain the present unhappy movement towards Rome. The British Critics have brought such persons to a different point of view, and exhibited a different phase of this standard divinity—one very well calculated to startle many of the admirers of the Quarterly Reviewer, whose knowledge of his authorities was derived from his pages. And it would be hardly enough to say, that the claim of the Tractarians to be allowed to follow the *precedent which has been set*, may be resisted on the ground that they have given very clear proofs that they want the *prudence and moderation*, which they seem themselves to admit are necessary qualifications for being admitted to the task. No doubt this is most true, and might be very easily substantiated. But still, apart from all apprehensions of the way in which their modern followers may be disposed to carry on ‘the development of the Church in the seventeenth



century,' I believe this Article contains such evidence of what that development was, and of the stage to which it was brought under the 'noble episcopate,' which 'reclaimed us,' as will make many doubt whether, in appealing as he did to the divinity of that memorable era, the Quarterly Reviewer took the best and wisest means of resisting effectually the tendency to Rome, which he seems, however tardily, yet sincerely, to dread in the Oxford Development of the present day.

Note C. p. 50.

THE letter in which Mr. Froude expresses his inability to make up his mind on the point, whether the worshipping of saints and honouring the Virgin and images, &c., as practised among Roman Catholics, is idolatrous or not, was written from Naples, Feb. 17, 1833. In the preface, however, an extract is given from a letter, also from Naples, which it is said had not come to hand until the first volume was printed. The date is not given; but it is presumed that it was written after the foregoing; and it appears that he had then come to the conclusion, that the people were idolaters in the sense which he thus explains:—'Since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot be quite confident of my information as it effects the character of the priests. . . . What I mean by calling these people idolaters, is, that I believe they look upon the saints and Virgin as good-natured people, that will try to get them let off easier than the Bible declares, and that, as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to them as a come-off. But this is a generalization for which I have not sufficient data.'

I have felt it right to quote this passage, though it of course does not weaken the force of the earlier extract, for the purpose for which I brought it forward. The purpose was to show how completely Mr. Froude's mind was discharged by his system from all regard to the positive obligations which he had contracted with his own Church, to say nothing of the duties arising fairly out of his position in it. And this would be sufficiently evinced by the fact, that four years after his ordination he describes himself, and as it appears without scruple or compunction, as unable to make up his mind about the truth of what he had so solemnly and repeatedly declared that he believed to be true. And this fact was the more striking, because he expresses this state of indecision, in a letter from Naples, written too after he had been in Sicily, and so after he had had so very much stronger evidence of the truth of the declaration, than he could have had when he made it. That his indecision afterwards gave way in any measure to the proofs which forced themselves upon him, is a fact which ought to be stated, but it leaves the use which I made of the other, undisturbed.

The following deliberate (as it would seem) view of the *indifferentism* which a minister of our Church may maintain, on the subject of transubstantiation, is a curious illustration of

the oblivion of Protestant declarations, which 'Catholic views' have a tendency to induce:—

'If any one say that the bread, after the order of nature, does not remain, I do not agree with him any more than does my Church, but I protest against nothing; rather if we are right, we reject and condemn the error, for truth is superior; nay more, it seems to me to be to the individual who is pious and believing, quite a secondary error; for if I go to the altar, I do not look for common bread, but for that bread which cometh from heaven, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ. It seems to me to be a question of no moment, whether the natural substance remains or no; if it depart I care not, and if it remain yet I look not for it, I see it not, I see nothing but the body and blood of the Lord after the words of consecration.'

This is from a *Letter to a Protestant Catholic*, by William Palmer, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford; and Deacon in the Church of England.\* I pass over a good deal in the extract which furnishes matter for long discussion,—I only remind my readers, that Mr. Palmer, when made a deacon of the Church of England, (if at no other time,) declared—solemnly, and in the presence of God, professed, testified, and declared,—concerning this doctrine, which he now holds to be *quite a secondary error*, (if it be an error, which it is 'if we are right,') that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 'there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.' And furthermore, 'that the sacrifice of the Mass as used by the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous.'

It is plain that if he thinks of this very straitly framed declaration at all, he must either think that it only declared his actual belief, and set no limits to his liberty to believe the very opposite the next day; or that it is satisfied by his not being sure that some portion of transubstantiation is true, while he is very sure that it is of little moment, whether it is true or not; and is also firmly convinced of the truth of a part of the doctrine, which, if it be true, seems to secure the sacrifice of the Mass from being idolatrous.

I am tempted to add an earlier specimen of the same style, which seems curious enough to make it worth transcribing. It is from a little book published by Roger Boyle, Dean of Cork, (1665) under the title of *Inquisitio in fidem Christianorum hujus sæculi*.

'De quo vehementius litigatur, quam de præsentia Domini in Augustissimo Eucharistiæ Sacramento? At ex dicta traditione manifestum est panem consecratum esse corpus Domini, et vinum consecratum ejus esse sanguinem. Græci, Latini, Pontifici, Protestantes, quicunque sacrosancto hoc sacramento utuntur, hunc et esse, et semper fuisse ecclesiæ universalis sensum testantur. Id quod in litem trahitur, est, An hæc præsentia sit per remotionem substantiæ panis, aut

\* I have never seen the Letter, but take the extract from the *British Critic*, No. LXII. p. 506.

per ejus identificationem cum substantia corporis Domini, aut per repræsentationem sacramentalem, aut quo prorsus modo ex infinitis illis, qui omnipotentiae Domini propatuli sunt. Demum, convenit de re, quia traditur Christum eam declarasse; disputatur de modo, quia a Christo eum, aut ab Apostolis ejus fuisse declaratum (*certè nobis*) non traditur. Adjiciam exemplum quod multorum instar fuerit. *Traditur dicto modo Ecclesiam Christi esse columnam veritatis, esse infallibilem.* Quod, inquam, hæc sit *traditio universalis*, ex eo liquet, quod omnes textus eo pertinentes alii Ecclesiae Romanæ largiantur, alii non nisi Ecclesiae universali concedant, alii nec Ecclesiae universali, nisi necessariis ad salutem. Istæ autem distinctiones quid sunt, nisi effugia recusantium assensum, ubi pudet dissentiri? Certe qui modos quæritant, rem fatentur. Ac mihi quidem in talibus hæc est regula: certis me submittere dubiis non maledicere. *Certus sum panem consecratum esse corpus domini; an vero substantiæ panis loco cesserit, relinquatur dubitandum, i.e. non exigitur ut credam, aut ita esse, aut non esse. Infallibiliter traditur ex ore Domini, ecclesiam Christi esse infallibilem. Certus ergo sum aliquam ecclesiam hoc frui privilegio; quod hæc (quæcunque) eo non fruatur, non sum certus, cum certus sim ecclesiam nonnullam infallibilitate frui, tum an non hæc (quamlibet) [hæc (quælibet)] habeat ignoro. Cum tam multa non revelaret dominus, modeste sapere jussit.*

Note D. p. 52.

ANOTHER of the Tracts of this period was the second on Reserve, upon which I have already spoken.

Another (No. 89.) *On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church*, would well deserve detailed notice on many grounds. I can only, however, mention it slightly, for the proof which it gave of the advance of the party in boldness. It contains a vindication of not a few of the interpretations of the Fathers which had been generally given up as indefensible, and which at an earlier stage of their course had been put from them by those writers, as having no connexion with their principles which obliged them to undertake the defence of them. But it would appear that they had arrived at the perception that the maintenance of them was really involved in their principles concerning Tradition, or perhaps that it was one of the things which *might now be ventured on with a reasonable hope of acceptance*, and accordingly they are maintained upon principles which seem to leave us no grounds for rejecting or adopting interpretations of Holy Writ, except the authority of the Fathers. It appears to be intended, that for aught we know, any interpretation of any passage may be the true one: it certainly is so if it be the interpretation which was given to the Church by the apostles; and that it is to be found in any early Father, is better evidence to us of its apostolicity, than we can have from reason exercised upon Scripture, of its unsoundness.

But the Tract at this period, which is most

remarkable for the reckless boldness which it exhibits,—the determination to maintain the views of the school in all their consequences, and to recommend them at all hazards, is one entitled *Lectures on the Scripture Proof of the Doctrines of the Church*, (No. 85). As a set-off against the objection which is often urged (they say) against the system which they have been maintaining, that it has but scanty evidence in Scripture, we have a laboured extenuation of the Scripture evidence for the fundamental truths which we believe, and an array of all the difficulties, external and internal, which affect the proof of the canon of Scripture, and of the apparent errors and contradictions which are to be found throughout the canonical Scriptures. All of these are pressed by the writer of the Tract in ample detail, and in the tone of a Rationalist commentator, or a Deistical objector, with the full foresight of the peril incurred of unsettling the faith of some in certain and vital truths, by attempting in this way to force upon their belief the debated principles of his party. The train of reflections, on which he defends himself for taking this desperate course, and perhaps stifles in his own mind, some rising misgivings of its lawfulness, is very curious.

‘It is then, what is commonly called ‘a kill or cure’ remedy. Certainly it is better to be inconsistent than consistently wrong,—to hold some truth amid error, than to hold nothing but error,—to believe than to doubt. Yet when I show a man that he is inconsistent, I make him decide whether of the two he loves better—the portion of truth he already holds, or the portion of error. If he loves the truth better, he will abandon the error; if the error, he will abandon the truth. And this is a fearful and anxious trial to put him under, and one cannot but feel loth to have recourse to it. . . . Yet all things considered, I think it only avails to the cautious use, not the abandonment, of the argument in question. For it is our plain duty to preach and defend the truth in a straightforward way. Those who are to stumble must stumble, rather than the heirs of grace should not hear. While we offend and alienate one man, we secure another; if we drive one man further the wrong way, we drive another further the right way. The cause of truth, the heavenly company of saints, gains, on the whole, more in the one way than the other. A wavering or shallow mind does perhaps as much harm to others as a mind consistent in error, nay, is in no very much better state itself; for if it has not developed into systematic scepticism merely because it has not had the temptation, its present conscientiousness is not worth much.’

Though all this may seem in a tone of hopeless hardihood, it discloses some natural compunctions at the contemplation of the course to which the author is making himself up. And as this last sentiment is at such open variance with the principles on which we are desired to pray that *we enter not into temptation*, one may hope that the daily petition which He who knew what was in man, has prescribed to us, may some time or other,



as it passes from the writer's lips, be made to make him feel *what manner of spirit he is of*.

Note D 2. p. 54.

THE fact is (as was very soon pointed out) that when the Convocation of 1562, by which our Articles were brought to their present form, first met, two and twenty of the five and twenty sessions of the Council of Trent were over, and the decrees passed at them known throughout Europe. Of the three held after the Convocation, the twenty-third contains the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon the sacrament of Holy Orders; the twenty-fourth, upon Matrimony; and the twenty-fifth, upon Purgatory, upon the invocation and worshipping of saints, and upon relics, and indulgences, and images. And it is in speaking upon Article XXII. which condemns 'the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints,' that this chronological point is made: 'And further, by the Romish doctrine is not meant the Tridentine [Statement, *Second Edition*,] because this Article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent.' p. 24. This happens to be literally true, as we have seen with respect to this particular decree, but it was not the author's intention so to limit his statement, as appears by his letter to Dr. Jelf; for he says, with reference to the letter of the Four Tutors:—'I only say that whereas they [the Thirty-nine Articles] were written before the decrees of Trent, they were not directed against those decrees.' p. 4. Again, 'it is a *fact* that our Articles were written *before* those decrees, and therefore are levelled, not against them, but against the authoritative teaching.' p. 13. Again, 'but the decrees of Trent were drawn up after the Articles.' p. 17. It was necessary therefore to remind the readers of the Tract, that whatever be the value of the point, it only applies to the last three sessions. And this, as I said, was done by Mr. Wilson, one of 'the Four Tutors,' at once, and subsequently by others. It is with the last of these sessions only that we are particularly concerned. And even with respect to it, it might be remarked, that the doctrine of the Church upon one weighty Article in it, Purgatory, is laid down in the canons of two of the Sessions which preceded the convocation, the 6th and the 22nd. And something in the same way might be said, in abatement of the force of the point, as applied to some other of its Articles. But the answer of most importance is that which applies to all, and which is given in the Charge, viz. that they were framed at the time, to affirm the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, and to condemn what had been taught in opposition to it by Protestants, and that they have been received ever since by friends and foes, as having attained their object.

Note E. p. 56.

THERE is hardly any section of the Tract which would not afford abundant materials to support the character that I have given of it. But its sophistry and misrepresentations have

been so often, and so fully, and so ably exposed, that it would be very superfluous labour to subject it now to any thing like a detailed examination. I have no intention of engaging in any such task now, but I wish by an example or two, to justify what I have said in the Charge, of the abuse of the more popular passages of the Homilies, by which the author contrives to cover their decided and very clearly expressed opposition to the errors of the Church of Rome, in their foundation and substance, and not merely in the grosser and more flagrant enormities in practice upon which such passages dwell. He resorts to the Homilies, it will be remembered, to fix the sense of the Articles, where he chooses to regard it as doubtful. And I am anxious to say, that supposing these doubts to be reasonable, there can be no objection in principle to resorting to the Homilies, to remove them. Making proper allowance for their form, and not expecting the strict accuracy of language, or the more formal and exact enunciations of truth, which are to be found in the Articles, and looking for their teaching rather in the substance of the discourse than in particular expressions, the Homilies must no doubt be regarded as authentic expositions of the sense of the Articles; not merely as being written at the time, and by the same persons, but as having been recognized in the Articles in the way in which they are. It is not therefore the fact of having recourse to the Homilies for any illustrations of the meaning of the Articles which may be needed, that I mean to object to; but the mode in which the reference is conducted; that by suppressions and evasions, an utter misrepresentation of the teaching of the Homily is drawn out, and through it, an utter misrepresentation of the meaning of the Article. But I have stated this with sufficient distinctness in the Charge, and will now proceed to prove by one or two striking examples.

Nothing, for example, can be more express than the Homilies are, against any use of images of any kind. But because, in declaring against it, some of the grosser abuses and excesses of the practice of the Church of Rome connected with images, are prominently put forward and enlarged upon; the writer after quoting a number of such passages, feels able to give the following as a true account of what they condemn.

'Now the veneration and worship condemned in these and other passages are such as these: kneeling before images, lighting candles to them, offering them incense, going on pilgrimage to them, hanging up crutches, &c. before them, lying tales about them, belief in miracles as if wrought by them through the illusion of the devil, decking them up immodestly, and providing incentives by them to bad passions; and, in like manner, merry music and minstrelsy, and licentious practices in honour of relics, counterfeit relics, multiplication of them, absurd pretences about them. THIS IS WHAT THE ARTICLE MEANS BY 'THE ROMISH DOCTRINE,' which, in agreement to one of the above extracts, it calls 'a fond thing;—*res futilis*; for



who can ever hope, except the grossest and most blinded minds, to be gaining the favour of the blessed saints, while they come with unchaste thoughts and eyes, that cannot cease from sin; and to be profited by 'pilgrimage-going,' in which 'Lady Venus and her son Cupid were rather worshipped wantonly in the flesh, than God the FATHER, and our SAVIOUR CHRIST HIS SON, truly worshipped in the SPIRIT?'"

So that it would seem that the Homilies allow it to be a reasonable and pious object, to seek to gain 'the favour of the blessed saints,' now departed; and to do this *by venerating and worshipping their images*, provided our modes of offering reverence to them be not chargeable with any of the irregularities, and disorders, and licentious practices, which are so pointedly condemned in the extracts given in the Tracts! Now I need not tell any one acquainted with the Homilies, how they really dispose of both those points. What they determine concerning the seeking to gain the favour of the blessed saints, will appear when we consider what is said in the Tract, about the *invocation of saints*. I will only notice here what they settle with respect to *images*. What the teaching of the Homilies on this point is likely to be, may be collected from what appears almost at the outset of the Sermon against 'Peril of Idolatry.' It anxiously explains very early that *idol* and *image* are two names of one and the same thing, differing only in the tongue from which they are derived. 'And though some to blind men's eyes have heretofore craftily gone about to make them to be taken for words of diverse signification in matters of religion, and have therefore usually named the likeness or similitude of a thing set up amongst the heathen in their temples or other places to be worshipped, an idol: but the like similitude, with us, set up in the Church, in place of worshipping, they call an image, as though these two words (*idol* and *image*) in Scripture, did differ in propriety and sense, which (as is aforesaid) differ only in sound and language, and in meaning be indeed all one, *specially in the Scriptures and matters of religion*. And our images also have been, and be, and if they be publicly suffered in the Churches or temples ever will be, also worshipped, and so idolatry committed to them, as in the last part of this Homily shall at large be declared and proved. Wherefore *our images in temples and Churches be indeed none other but idols*, as unto the which idolatry hath been, is, and ever will be committed.

And it goes on in accordance with this commencement. It refers to the strictness with which God in His law forbade His ancient people to make any images as objects of religious reverence, and the awful threats by which these prohibitions were enforced, as of themselves sufficient to restrain any who had the fear of God before their eyes, from the worshipping of images, setting them up, or maintaining them. 'You will say, peradventure these things pertain to the Jews, what have we to do with them? Indeed they pertain no less to us Christians, than to them.

For if we be the people of God, how can the word and law of God not appertain to us? St. Paul alleging one text out of the Old Testament, concludeth generally for other Scriptures of the Old Testament as well as that, saying, *Whatsoever is written before*, (meaning in the Old Testament) *is written for our instruction*. Rom. xv. Which sentence is most specially true of such writings as contain the immutable law and ordinances of God, in no age or time to be altered, nor of any persons of any nations or age to be disobeyed, *such as the above rehearsed places be*.—For further confirmation however, towards the end of the first part, the New Testament is shown to coincide with the Old in this matter.—The second part contains the testimony of ancient writers, with explanations and enforcements, and the result of both parts is (as is stated in the third part) 'that it is declared by God's word, the sentences of the doctors, and the judgment of the primitive Church, which was most pure and sincere, that all images, as well ours as the idols of the Gentiles, be by God's word forbidden, and therefore unlawful, specially in temples and churches.' And in the third part, the various modes in which both are attempted to be evaded are considered, and refuted.—But I suppose it unnecessary to enter further into the Homily for the purpose of showing how very greatly its testimony against image-worship is misrepresented, when it is confined to those grosser abuses connected with the practice which, according to the Tract, are the exclusive objects of its censure.

But the Tract goes a step farther, and a very curious step it is. Having stated as we have seen, that these abuses and excesses and enormities in the practice of the Church are what the Article has in view, in the Romish doctrine concerning images which it condemns, it proceeds to show that the Council of Trent condemns the very same things. 'Here again it is remarkable that, urged by the truth of the allegation, the Council of Trent is obliged, both to confess the above-mentioned enormities in the veneration of relics, and images, and to forbid them.' And the writer gives an extract from the Decree in support of the assertion. So that here at least there is a perfect harmony between the thirty-nine articles and the Tridentine Decrees. The article condemns the *Romish doctrine* indeed concerning the veneration of images, but it appears by the Homilies that by the *Romish doctrine* it means, *only certain corrupt practices*; and these the Tridentine Decree also condemns and forbids. This is the representation of the Tract.

Now it is very easy to show that in point of fact the Homily and the Decree, however they may agree in condemning certain excesses, are diametrically opposed as to the substance and matter of the Doctrine; so that there is not a single point that the Decree establishes, which the Homily does not by anticipation oppose and overthrow. This is very easily shown; and it is so curious an illustration of the shameless unfairness of the Tract, that it seems worth spending a little time upon it.



The Council of Trent commands all bishops, and others upon whom the office of teaching devolves, to teach: 'that the images of Christ and the Virgin Mother of God, and the other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in temples: and that 'due honour and veneration' are to be paid to them. The Homilies, as we have seen, prohibit absolutely the setting up or maintaining of images in churches and temples, even if they be set up without any design of making them objects of religious reverence, and even though the most careful precautions be taken against their becoming such. They evidently regard this as the only form in which setting images up in churches admits of any defence, but, even with such objects and such safeguards, they declare in the strongest and most express language against the lawfulness of the usage. I have already given some passages, in which the Homily declares that they are not to be placed in temples and churches; that Scripture, the primitive church, and the highest authorities among the fathers, are against the practice, and that experience has proved that it infallibly leads to the worship of them, which is idolatry. Such passages might be multiplied fourfold. I will give but one more, however: 'When they say that images, so they be not worshipped, as things indifferent, may be tolerable in temples and churches; we infer and say for the adversative, that all our images of God, our Saviour Christ, and his saints, publicly set up in temples and churches, places peculiarly appointed to the true worshipping of God, be not things indifferent, nor tolerable, but against God's law and commandment, taking their own interpretation and exposition of it.'

Here is tolerably direct opposition. Now I suppose I need hardly go on to show, that there is no less irreconcilable opposition between the doctrine of the Homily, and the next step in the Decree I have quoted; which declares that the images so set up are to receive due honour and veneration. They do not define indeed what *due* honour and veneration are. But this is because they were issuing their commands to those who knew the established principles and practice on the matter in which it is plain they had no intention of changing. But it so happens that farther on in the Decree, *kissing these images, uncovering the head, and falling down before them*, are particularized among the acts of veneration which were bestowed upon them. And it happens also these are among the acts specified in the Homily, and denounced as unlawful. But indeed there are not a few passages in the Homilies to prove that they regard every form of outward reverence, shown to images, as part of the forbidden worship. e. g. 'And in the second book of Paralipomenon, the twenty-ninth chapter, all the outward rites and ceremonies, as burning of incense and much other wherewith God in the temple was honoured, is called *cultus*, (to say,) worshipping, which is forbidden straitly by God's word to be given to images.'

The Decree goes on to guard that this last command from the charge which it was foreseen would be made against it, by stating that it is not given, 'because it is supposed that there is any virtue or divinity in them, on account of which they ought to be worshipped; or because anything is to be sought for from them; or because faith is to be put in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles who put their trust in idols: but because the honour which is paid to them is referred to the originals which they represent; so that through the images which we kiss, and before which we bow our heads, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and show reverence to the saints whose likeness the images bear.'

Now the Homily could not more explicitly write in opposition to every part of this defence, if the authors had read the Decree. And this is not surprising, when we consider that it is but the repetition of a very ancient plea. As to the attempt of the Synodists to distinguish the grounds on which they command reverence to be shown to images from those upon which idols were worshipped by the Gentiles, the Homilist denies that it has any foundation. First he says that they show a reverence to the *images* of the saints, which saints and angels would reject with horror if offered directly to themselves, as feeling that it entrenched upon the honour due to God only. But this is not the only argument against this plea. "And furthermore, in that they say they do not worship the images, as the Gentiles did their idols, but God and the saints, whom the images do represent; and therefore that their doings before images be not like the idolatry of the Gentiles before their idols: St. Augustine, Lactantius, and Clemens, do prove evidently, that *by this answer they be all one with the Gentiles idolaters*. The Gentiles, saith Augustine, which seem to be of the purer religion, say, We worship not the images, but by the corporeal image we do behold the signs of the things which we ought to worship. *August. Psalm cxxxv.*" And then, after two quotations from Lactantius and Clemens, (Pseudo Clemens) to the same effect, it adds: 'for notwithstanding this excuse, St. Augustine, Clemens, and Lactantius, prove them idolaters,' &c.

But finally the Synodists rest what they enjoin in such matters upon its concurrence with the decrees of former Councils, and especially of the second Council of Nice against the opposers of images. Hear what the Homily says upon this Council of Nice, which is thus recognized and made the foundation of the Tridentine Decree: "And at the second Council of Nice, the bishops and clergy decreed, that images should be worshipped: and so, by occasion of these stumbling-blocks, not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise, not the people only, but the

in the quotation. The marks which show that there is an omission are given, but it appears a strange one to choose to make, as the sentence certainly seems to be very important to the determination of the question, What is the veneration and worship of images condemned in the Homilies? And the same may be said of the rest of the omitted passage.

\* This sentence occurs in a passage quoted at p. 32 of the Tract, but is rather curiously omitted



bishops,—not the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves, (who should have been guides the right way, and lights to shine in darkness,) being blinded by the bewitching of images, and blind guides of the blind, fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry.”

I need not pursue this point further. It must be abundantly plain, that the teaching of the Homily is not, as the Tract represents, in accordance with the decree of the Council in this matter, but diametrically opposed to what the latter establishes and commands to be taught. And that so the homilest, and all who teach his doctrine, or hold it without teaching it, that is, all faithful ministers and members of the Church, are under the anathema of the Decree: *Si quis autem his decretis contraria docuerit, and senserit, anathema esto.*

Another very striking example of the flagrant misrepresentations of the Tract is contained in what is said of the Invocation of Saints. The Romish doctrine concerning the *Invocation of Saints* (as well as other things there enumerated,) is condemned in the twenty-second Article as ‘a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.’ The force of this sentence is attempted to be abated by the following curious train of argument:—‘To know what it is that is condemned, we must know what is meant by *invocation* in the Article. Now, it is evidently, that ‘the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight’ cannot be meant; for the Psalms, which we use in our daily service, do that. Nor can it mean, ‘to pray to unseen beings to bless us,’ for Bishop Ken does that. (!) Nor can it be intended to condemn invocations, ‘if we mean nothing definite by them, addressing them to beings which we know cannot hear, and using them as interjections,’ for the Homilies themselves do that.\* Well, then, what does it mean? Why, to understand that, as the Article does not specify the sort of invocation which it condemns, and as it is shown that it cannot be regarded as “condemning every sort,” the best way is to resort to the Homilies. We find them very strong and very full upon the various absurd and offensive superstitions which abounded in the Church of Rome in connexion with saint-worship. Some of the passages, in which they so speak are given; and then the result is stated thus:—‘Whereas, then, it has been already shown, that not *all* invocation is wrong, this last passage plainly tells us, *what kind* of invocation is not allowable, or *what is meant by invocation in its exceptionable sense*: viz: a thing proper to God, and two instances are specially given of such calling and invocation—viz. *sacrificing* and *falling down in worship*. Besides this, the

Homilist adds, that it is wrong to pray to them for ‘necessaries in this world,’ and to accompany their services with ‘piping, singing, chanting, and playing’ on the organ, and of ‘invoking saints as patrons of particular elements, countries, arts, or remedies.’ p. 40.

This then is the account to be given of the Doctrine of the Homilies, and therefore of the Article, on the invocation of saints! Now, the fact is, that what is to be collected from the Homilies, indeed what is plainly expressed by them, is not that if we address to the saints *such invocations as are proper to God, we do what is wrong and forbidden*, but this: that if we address *invocations* to saints, we give to them *what is proper to God*, and, therefore, that whenever we invoke them, and for whatsoever it be, we do what is wrong and forbidden.

The second part of the Homily on Prayer professes to show *whom we ought to call upon, and to whom we ought always to direct our prayers*. And in the most explicit manner it is declared, that it is God, and God *alone*, to whom we are to pray. And this not with the limitation in the summary given in the Tract—viz. when we are seeking ‘necessaries of this life,’ but absolutely and without any limitation of any kind, “whosoever we need or lack anything *pertaining either to the body or the soul*, it behooveth us to run only to God, who is the only giver of all good things.” And then, after some proofs from Scripture: “Thus, then, it is plain, by the infallible word of truth and life, that in all our necessities we must flee unto God, direct our prayers unto him, call upon his holy name, desire help at his hands, and *none other’s*; whereof, if we will yet have a further reason, mark that which followeth:”—and then it proceeds to show, that there are four conditions which must be found ‘in every such one that must be called upon,’ and that they are to be found only in God. The passage in which we find these reasons, and others, against ‘invocation or prayer,’ to inferior beings, is quoted in the Tract, and I need not go through it more particularly in detail, because the reader will remember, that the question is not whether the reasons given for what is laid down are conclusive, or even whether the principle itself is true, but what it is, and whether it is truly represented in the Tract. And upon both points I have given, I should think, quite enough.

It is true that the writer of the Tract intimates, that we are precluded from interpreting the Homily as determining, (or perhaps that the Homily itself is precluded from deciding,) that *all invocation* of saints is wrong, because as he says, ‘it has already been shown that not *all* invocation is wrong.’ We have seen how it has been shown. And I suppose it is not a proof to which any lengthened reply can be necessary. The ‘invocations to angels to praise and bless God,’ to which the writer refers as frequent in the Psalms, are evidently not intended really to move these beings to express their love, and reverence, and gratitude to God, but are a warm and poetical expression of the Psalmist’s own sense of what is due to God from *all His works in all places of His dominion*. And if there could be any doubt of this, it would be apparent to every one,

\* e.g. ‘We have left them neither heaven, nor earth, nor water, nor country, nor city, peace nor war to rule and govern, neither men, nor beasts, nor their diseases to cure; that a godly man might justly, for zealous indignation, cry out, *O heaven, O earth and seas*, what madness and wickedness against God are men fallen into!—*On the Peril of Idolatry.*



from the fact, that he addresses or invokes, in just the same way, indeed in the same terms, the various great objects of inanimate nature, the earth and the sea, the floods and the hills, to join in his praises to God. And the same may be said of the *Benedicite*.

As to Bishop Ken:—Some one, I think, attempted to defend him from the charge which is implied in the reference to him in the Tract, by pointing out that (though he desires that an office may be performed by his guardian angel, which seems to trench upon the office of the Holy Spirit) yet that his address is to God and not to the angel. It appears evidently that this is the case. But if it were not, and if Bishop Ken did ask directly angels or saints to bless him, it does not, I trust, follow, that we, therefore, may or ought to do so; or, which is even more perhaps the point at issue, that the Homilist thought that we might or ought.

As to the attempt to prove that the Homilies could not, without inconsistency, forbid *all invocation*, because 'they themselves contain *apostrophes*, as *O Heavens! O Earth and seas!* it looks more like a sorry jest than a serious argument, and I suppose it cannot be necessary to give it a serious answer.

It must be very plain already, that in stating the amount of the testimony in the Homily upon the subject of invocation, the writer has been guilty of very great misrepresentation. But the unfairness with which he is chargeable is greater and more complicated than it has yet appeared, as will be seen by what follows. He admits distinctly, that according to his explanation of what the Article meant to censure, the *ora pro nobis* was not condemned by it: that is to say, (in the mode which he takes of determining the scope of the Article) that it is not condemned in the Homilies. Now, it happens that we are not left to collect the teaching of the Homilies on that point in the way of inference from the passages which I have given, for they expressly consider and decide it. Indeed, in the third part of the Homily on Peril of Idolatry, it is said, that the *image-maintainers* did foolishly and wickedly make 'of the true servants of God, false Gods, by attributing to them the power and honour which is God's, and due to Him only.' And, after some proof, it adds, 'If answer be made, that they make saints but intercessors to God and means for such things as they would obtain of God: that is, even after the Gentiles' idolatrous usage, to make them of saints, gods, called *Dii Medioximi*, to be meant intercessors and helpers to God, as though he did not hear, or should be weary if he did all alone.' And, in the Homily on Prayer (second Part), the folly and perverseness, and disregard of Scripture, which such a proceeding exhibits, are shown, and the vanity of all the excuses for it exposed. First is considered the repugnance to approach God, which one, who has sinned against him naturally feels. The Homilist reasons against this and asks: 'Shall we think that the saints are more merciful in hearing sinners than God?' Then follows another reason for having recourse to the help of saints: 'O, but I dare not (will some man say) trouble God at all times with my

prayers; we see that in kings' houses, and courts of princes, men cannot be admitted unless they first use the help and means of some special noblemen to come unto the speech of the king, and to obtain the thing that they would have.' To this plea an answer from Ambrose is given. And then other supplementary pleas are considered and disposed of. And it is at the end of all this discussion of the reasons in support of *asking the saints for their intercession*, that this passage comes in: 'Invocation is a thing proper unto God, which if we attribute unto the saints, it soundeth to their reproach, neither can they well bear it at our hands. When Paul had healed a certain lame man, which was impotent in his feet, at Lystra, the people would have done sacrifice unto him and Barnabas; who rending their clothes refused it, and exhorted them to worship the true God. Acts xiv. Likewise in the Revelation, when St. John fell before the angel's feet to worship him, the angel would not permit him to do it, but commanded that he should worship God. Apoc. xix. Which examples declare unto us, that the saints and angels in heaven will not have us to do *any honour* unto them *that is due and proper unto God*.' This passage is given in the Tract, and is the passage referred to (in the quotation which I have made from it p. 275,) as explaining what kind of invocation is forbidden. The natural way of dealing with it would be, to take simply as it stands, the position with which it begins, viz. 'Invocation is a thing proper unto God;' and to regard the examples which follow as illustrative of the way in which God's servants shrank from receiving any honour which was proper to Him, from which we were to conclude how determined they would show themselves to reject *invocation*, if they knew that it was offered to them, and could communicate their feelings to us. But this, as we have seen, is not what is done. The opening declaration is taken as if it were: '*There is a kind of invocation which is proper unto God*,' and the examples are then regarded as helping us to determine what kind that is: 'viz. *sacrificing and falling down in worship*.' Other quotations enable the writer to add to the catalogue some particulars for which the Homilist lays it down, that it is wrong to pray, as well as some accompaniments of invocations, which are condemned;—the whole enumeration of things prohibited, however, *leaves out invocations to the saints to pray for us*. Now, the management by which this mode of dealing with the passage becomes possible, seems very worthy of notice. A passage of some length, which goes before this quotation, is left out, without any intimation that there is any omission. I have just given the substance of this omitted passage; in which it will appear, that it contains, as I have said, a discussion and refutation of the different reasons which are given by Romanists to show, that invocation or prayer to the saints for their intercession, is lawful. These reasons are considered and overthrown, and it is then that the passage comes in, 'Invocation is a thing proper unto God.' And looking, as he does, in the Homily to determine what in-

vocation the Article intends to prohibit, it is evidently only by this omission, of which as I said no notice is given, that the author is enabled to bring out, that, while the Article only forbids such invocation as *trenches upon worship*, it leaves the question, whether *ora pro nobis* be such, an open question.\* For, it is not merely that all invocation, without any exception, is pronounced to be unlawful in the Homily; but, moreover, the question, whether the *ora pro nobis* is lawful, is specifically considered, and decided in the negative. And the way, as I have explained, in which the writer of the Tract gets rid of this testimony, is not by reasoning against it, or denying its authority, but by leaving it out, though it occurs in a passage which he quotes, and leaving it out without giving any intimation that he is doing so!

The Tract goes on as before to intimate that in this matter the Articles and Tridentine decrees harmonize. 'Here again, as before, the Article [explained by the Homily] gains a witness and concurrence from the Council of Trent.' The best way of judging how far the Council agrees with the Homily is to compare what we have quoted, with the Decree. What the Bishops, &c. are enjoined to teach on this head is: 'that the saints who are reigning together with Christ, offer prayers to God for men: that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them: and for benefits to be obtained from God by his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour, to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance: and that they are guilty of impiety who deny that the saints now enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that invoking them to pray for individuals is idolatry, or that it is opposed to the word of God, or that it derogates from the honour of Christ, the one Mediator between God and man; or that it is folly to address mentally or in words those who are reigning in heaven.'

Now I need not go over the case minutely, for it will appear from what I have given from the Homily, that there is not one of the sentiments or opinions here stigmatized as *impious*, which the Homily does not maintain, with the exception of one. It does not venture upon so presumptuous an assertion as to pronounce that the saints do not pray for men, but it does say, that no one knows, or can know, that they do; and as to the rest—every thing which the decree declares that it is impious to assert, it asserts; and all that it declares to be impious to deny, it denies. And so again the Homilist, and all who symbolize with him in this matter, fall under the anathema of the decree before referred to, which includes all who oppose, and all who dissent from, what is decreed.

It would be very easy to add to these examples, but these two are enough for my purpose. The author of the Tract, in a letter written subsequently, in looking back upon this publication, acknowledges that there was a vagueness and deficiency in some places as

to the conclusions he would draw from the premises stated, and "a consequent opening to the charge of a disingenuous understatement of the contrariety between the Articles and the actual Roman system." And, for this, he proposes to account in part thus: 'that the main drift of the Tract being that of illustrating the Articles from the Homilies, the doctrines of the Articles are sometimes brought out only so far as the Homilies explain them, which is in some cases an inadequate representation.'—*Letter to Dr. Jelf*. I should think that those who read the two foregoing cases carefully, will be of opinion that this is not an available apology. It could only be so if the explanation of the doctrine of the Articles which the Homilies supply were fairly brought out. But it is not. And I have furnished my readers with evidence (to which the Tract itself will enable them to make large additions) to show that this charge of 'a disingenuous understatement' applies without any mitigation to the author's professed attempt to exhibit what the teaching of the Homilies is, on the doctrines condemned in the Article.\*

\* It may be instructive to give a specimen of the efforts which are very perseveringly made to indoctrinate the rising generation in the Church in conformity with the principles which the Tract was intended to support and protect. The following extract is from *A Short and Easy Catechism for the use of Young Persons in the Church of England*, which is described in the preface as intended to be auxiliary to our Church Catechism, and it is said that 'throughout the compilation indeed the most scrupulous pains have been taken to introduce nothing to which a member of the Church of England will not, or at least may not, find a counterpart in her system as it is brought before his eyes. It is of course needless to say that the standard, according to which the questions and answers have been framed, is not the prevailing practice of our Church, but her formal requirements; or rather the rule of the Catholic Church, as admitted and attested by her.' Here is a specimen of the 'Catholic principles' which our Church admits and attests.

Q. Do those words "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," forbid the making of any images?

A. No; they forbid the making only of idols; that is, they forbid making images to be adored or honoured as God, as it is declared in these words, "Thou shalt not bow down to them and worship them."

Q. What are we commanded to do by the second commandment?

A. We are commanded to hope in God, and to love Him with all our hearts, and to serve Him all our days.

Q. What is forbidden by the second commandment?

A. It forbids us to worship idols, or to give any creature the honour due to God.

Q. What is the honour due to God?

A. The honour due to God is a supreme and sovereign honour, which can be given to no other: We must worship Him as our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier.

\* \* \* \* \*

Q. Are pictures and holy symbols allowable in the Church?

A. Yes; for they movingly represent to us the life and passion of our blessed Lord, and other doctrines of our most holy faith.

\* *Newman's Letter to Jelf*, p. 24.



Having described (p. 91,) the proceeding by which the author of the Tract, enables himself to represent the Article, as explained by the Homily, as leaving the *ora pro nobis* an open question, I thought it unnecessary to comment upon it. I think however that it may be useful perhaps to exhibit it distinctly, and I therefore print the passage from the Homily, putting in brackets the parts which the Tract leaves out, without giving any notice that there is any omission:

"O but I dare not (will some man say) trouble God at all times with my prayers: we see that in kings' houses, and courts of princes, men cannot be admitted, unless they first use the help and means of some special nobleman, to come to the speech of the king, and to obtain the thing that they would have. [To this reason doth St. Ambrose answer very well, writing upon the first chapter to the Romans. Therefore, saith he, we use to go unto the king by officers and noblemen, because the king is a mortal man, and knoweth not to whom he may commit the government of the commonwealth. But to have God our friend, from whom nothing is hid, we need not any helper, that should further us with his good word, but only a devout and godly mind. *Ambrose super cap. i. Rom.* And if it be so, that we need not one to entreat for us, why may we not content ourselves with that one Mediator, which is at the right hand of God the Father, and there liveth for ever to make intercession for us? *Heb. vii.* As the blood of Christ did redeem us on the cross, and cleanse us from our sins: even so it is now able to save all them that come unto God by it. For] Christ, sitting in heaven, hath an everlasting priesthood, and always prayeth to his Father for them that be penitent, obtaining by virtue of his wounds, which are evermore in the sight of God, not only perfect remission of our sins, but also all other necessities that we lack in this world; so that this holy Mediator is sufficient in heaven, and needeth no others to help him. [*Matt. vi. James v. Coloss. iv. 1 Tim. ii.* Why then do we pray one for another in this life? some man perchance will here demand. Forsooth we are willed so to do, by the express commandment both of Christ and his disciples, to declare therein as well the faith that we have in Christ towards God, as also the mutual charity that we bear one towards another, in that we pity our brother's case, and make our humble petition to God for him. *But that we should pray unto saints, neither have we any commandment in all the Scripture, nor yet example which we may safely follow.* So that being done without authority of God's word, it lacketh the ground of faith, and therefore cannot be acceptable before God. "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin." And the Apostle saith, that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Heb. xi. Rom. x. xiv.* Yet thou wilt object further, that the saints in heaven pray

for us, and that their prayer proceedeth of an earnest charity, that they have towards their brethren on earth. *Whereto it may be well answered, first, that no man knoweth whether they do pray for us or no.* And if any will go about to prove it by the nature of charity, concluding, that because they did pray for men on earth, therefore they do much more the same now in heaven; then may it be said by the same reason, that as oft as we do weep on earth, they do also weep in heaven, because while they lived in this world, it is most certain and sure they did so. And for that place which is written in the Apocalypse, namely, that the angel did offer up the prayers of the saints upon the golden altar, it is properly meant, and ought properly to be understood, of those saints that are yet living on earth, and not of them that are dead; otherwise what need were it that the angels should offer up their prayers, being now in heaven before the face of Almighty God? But admit that the saints do pray for us, yet do we not know how, whether specially for them which call upon them, or else generally for all men, wishing well to every man alike. If they pray specially for them which call upon them, then it is like they hear our prayers, and also know our heart's desire. *Which th<sup>g</sup> to be false is already proved, both by the Scriptures, and also by the authority of Augustine. Let us not therefore put our trust or confidence in the Saints or martyrs that be dead.* Let us not call upon them, nor desire help at their hands: but let us always lift up our hearts to God, in the name of his dear Son Jesus Christ, for whose sake as God hath promised to hear our prayer, so he will truly perform it.] Invocation is a thing proper unto God, which if we attribute unto the saints, it soundeth to their reproach, neither can they well bear it at our hands. When Paul had healed a certain lame man, which was impotent in his feet, at Lystra, the people would have done sacrifice unto him and Barnabas; who rendering their clothes refused it, and exhorted them to worship the true God. *Acts xiv.* Likewise in the Revelation, when St. John fell before the angel's feet to worship him, the angel would not permit him to do it, but commanded him that he should worship God. *Apoc. xix.* Which examples declare unto us, that the saints and angels in heaven will not have us to do any honour unto them, that is due and proper unto God." I may give the conclusion from the entire—"Let us not, therefore, in anything mistrust his goodness; let us not fear to come before the throne of his mercy, *let us not seek the aid and help of saints,* but let us come boldly ourselves, nothing doubting but God for Christ's sake, in whom he is well pleased, will hear us without a spokesman, and accomplish our desire in all such things as shall be agreeable to his holy will."

#### Note F. 60.

The author, apparently for the opportunity which he gains, of sneering at the Reformation and its fruits, pledged himself, at least, (*unless he changes his mind,*) against using the power of his party for the purpose of carrying such changes in the existing Church

Q. Is there any idolatry in honouring the saints and angels?

A. No; provided we honour them only with an inferior honour, not as Gods, or with God's honour.

formularies as might accommodate them more to their principles. 'Even in such points as he may think the English Church deficient, never can be, *without a great alteration of sentiment*, be party to forcing the opinion, or project of one School upon another. Religious changes, to be beneficial, should be the act of the whole body; they are worth little if they are the mere act of a majority. No good can come of any change which is not heartfelt, a development of feeling springing up freely and calmly within the bosom of the whole body itself. Moreover, a change in theological teaching involves either the commission or the confession of sin; it is either the profession or renunciation of erroneous doctrine; if it does not succeed in proving past guilt, it, *ipso facto*, implies present. In other words, every change in religion carries with it its own condemnation, which is not attended by deep repentance. Even supposing then that our changes in contemplation were good in themselves, they would cease to be good to a Church, in which they were the fruits not of the quiet conviction of all, but of the agitation, or tyranny, or intrigue of a few; nurtured not in mutual love, but in strife and envying; perfected not in humiliation and grief, but in pride, elation, and triumph. Moreover it is a very serious truth, that persons and bodies who put themselves into a disadvantageous state, cannot at their pleasure extricate themselves from it. They are unworthy of it; they are in prison, and CHRIST is the Keeper . . . . . Till we her children are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church our mother sit still;—let her children be content to work in chains; let us submit to our imperfections as a punishment; let us go on teaching through the medium of indeterminate statements\* and inconsistent precedents, and principles but partially developed. We are not better than our fathers: let us bear to be what Hammond was, or Andrews, or Hooker; let us not faint under that body of death, which they bore about in patience, nor shrink from the penalty of sins, which they inherited from the age before them.'

This exhortation to *patience* may be very sincere, but it bears an unhappy resemblance to—

'Good friends, kind friends, let me not stir you up To such a sudden flood of mutiny.'

And, indeed, one is often reminded of the celebrated speech from which these lines are taken, by the way in which weak sedatives and strong stimulants are intermingled, in the similar descants upon the wrongs and outrages to which Catholics are subject in the Anglican communion, in which the writer and his colleagues are so fond of indulging. No doubt they know very well what they are about. And they have left others no excuse for ignorance of their objects. A sane man, who goes on sedulously feeding and fanning a flame, will hardly get credit for any serious intention of keeping it down, when he sprinkles from time to time, parenthetically, a drop of water on it.

\* 'Let her go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies.'—*First Edition*.

But I will not comment upon any part of the passage, except that in which it is pronounced, that 'every change in religion brings with it its own condemnation which is not attended with deep repentance.' Repentance for what? The author's purpose seems to require, *for the change itself*. But though that may be intimated in an ambiguous sentence, it is too flagrantly unreasonable to be expressly maintained. And if it be meant, repentance for the sins which made the change necessary, one does not see how it could fairly be used for the writer's purpose, supposing it to be true. For who will say that the Reformers (who are the persons aimed at) did not repent truly and bitterly of all the errors and superstitions in which they had shared before they were enlightened? Certainly their joy and thankfulness at the 'change in theological teaching,' which they were the instruments in introducing, is no proof of any want of true repentance for that which made it necessary. On the contrary, the deeper such repentance was, the livelier might be their thankfulness and joy.

But it seems to be very far indeed from being true. For suppose they did not repent as they ought, however that might condemn *them*, why should it condemn the change itself, which they brought about? May not that change have been right and needful, a signal blessing to the Church, and in accordance with the will of her great Head, though the principal instruments in it were in any measure defective in right feeling, and even right motives? This is too obvious to be insisted on. And we may be very sure, that, should the author's party acquire power to *unprotestantize* the Church to the extent of their desires, and should he himself in consequence experience a *great alteration of sentiment*, he will find no difficulty in giving very sufficient reasons for not waiting until the needful changes can be had, as the result of *the quiet conviction of all*; or as *the development of feelings springing up freely and calmly within the bosom of the whole body itself*. But, of course, such professions are not to be regarded as having any more serious purpose than enabling the author to introduce an attack on the Reformers.

The following extract is a little in advance of Tract XC., and seems to make it clear, that though a revision of the Articles is not absolutely necessary to enable men of 'Catholic views' to subscribe to them, yet it is very needful in order to preserve the Catholic character of the Church.

'We thankfully believe that a true Catholic may conscientiously subscribe the Articles of the Church of England. Still there seems too much reason to apprehend that, without some more stringent test of Catholicity *than we are likely to obtain, or ought, perhaps, under existing circumstances*, to desire, our own branch of the Church must remain, as heretofore, (in the great body of her members,) the *apparent* representative of a very different principle. It is hardly to be hoped that with Articles more or less of an "uncertain sound," which, without absolutely infringing any point of Catholic doctrine, contain so little of *explicit*



contradiction to some of the less obvious, but not less essential, characteristics of the Protestant error,—the generality of the English clergy should be secured against more or less sympathy with those relaxed views of religion which are quite certain to be rife in an intellectual age and a commercial country. . . . Protestantism, in its essence, and in all its bearings, is so characteristically the religion of corrupt human nature, that with formulae *unambiguously exclusive of it*, and an actual administration of the existing system, tolerant, to say the very least of it, it can hardly fail, but that the general tone of the National Church should remain, for a very long time at least, comparatively uninfluenced by the efforts of a few individuals to elevate it. This we say, to encourage patience and perseverance, not as intimating distrust. . . . Their progress, [the progress of ‘Catholic principles’] under the circumstances, has no doubt been so extraordinary, nay, (not to mince the matter) so miraculous, that one hardly dares to venture upon unsanguine predictions; while yet it seems right, on the other hand, to state difficulties at their worst.—*British Critic*, No. LIX. pp. 27, 28.

As to the Prayer Book it is acknowledged in the same article that ‘her Liturgy, of course, is, *in its essential features*, Catholic.’ And with *it*, therefore, it would appear that at the time the above passage was written, it was settled that Churchmen of ‘Catholic views’ might be content. But, (without professing to know what may have been said in the same publication or elsewhere, in the interval, upon the subject,) there appears a very ominous passage in a recent number, which shows how far the Prayer Book is from being regarded as fitted to satisfy the *ritual* wants of the Church when once it is Catholicised in *doctrine*. ‘Consider, even under the ordinary view of that holy Sacrament, the series of recollections connected in the religious mind with our Communion-office; and we shall the more see that the Prayer Book must ever be the great external bond of sympathy for English Churchmen as such: on this, as on a text, must be engrafted Catholic doctrine; *on this, as on a foundation, must be reared, Catholic ceremonial*.’—No. LXV. p. 222.

11  
01





